BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

THE

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW

BC

Under the Direction of

MOST REV. EDMOND F. PRENDERGAST, D. D.

RIGHT REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., ASSOCIATE EDITOR,

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXXIX.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1914.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA:

610 SOUTH WASHINGTON SQUARE.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIX.—OCTOBER, 1914—No. 156

THE POPES AND THE NORMAN INVASIONS OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

CHRISTIANITY was very early brought to Britain, and took such root there that many Britons, as we learn from Bede, suffered martyrdom under Diocletian at the commencement of the fourth century. In Ireland, too, Christianity was early known, as was likely, indeed, consequent upon Irish commercial intercourse with Gaul at a very early date. Christianity was widely spread over Gaul as early certainly as the second century, and to Gaul the Irish frequently went on predatory excursions, carrying away from her coast Christian captives, from whom they would be likely to learn the Christian faith. One of these captives, about the year 403, was the great St. Patrick, at that time a lad sixteen years of age. For six years he lived a bond slave among the Irish, tending their herds and flocks, his long hours of watching the while relieved by constant prayers and his sufferings from want and exposure sweetened by union of them with those of his Saviour. By such discipline, combined with the knowledge he gained of the Irish in this dreary time, was he divinely trained to become their Apostle when, in 432, he arrived again amongst them, commissioned by Pope Celestine for the purpose. "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatus a Papa Coelestino Palladius primus episcopus mittitur," we read in Prosper's Chronicle, showing that Christianity then already was in Ireland. Palladius died, however, in the following year; nor had he the qualifications which St. Patrick had acquired for a mission to the Irish. And

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1913, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

as evidence of the success of St. Patrick's mission and of the good will of the Irish is the fact that in the course of the sixth century Christianity spread from end to end of the island, and Ireland "became the Island of Saints, the home and refuge of learning and holiness and the nursery whence missionaries went forth to carry the light of faith to the nations of the European continent. Her seats of learning, her monasteries and nunneries and her charitable institutions were unsurpassed, either in number or excellence, by those of any nation of the world."[1]

Meanwhile, in Caledonia—named Scotland not before the eleventh century—Christianity likewise spread, the Picts of her southern portion, who had come from Scandinavia, being converted in 421 by Bishop Ninian, who had been educated in Rome, and the Caledonians of the north, like the Irish, either a Gallic or a Celtic tribe, by St. Columba, a prince from Ireland, a century and a half later, his mission extending southward also.

Christianity in Britain in course of time unhappily declined, and by the sixth century it was evident that another mission was needed for its restoration. The British historian Gildas, who in this century wrote of the condition of both the clergy and the laity, more than justifies Dr. Döllinger in saying: "Melancholy is the contrast with the flourishing condition of the Irish Church, that is presented to us by the state of decay and oppression in which at this period we find the Church of Britain. The devout Gildas has left to us a strongly colored picture of the degeneracy and corruption of the people and of the disgraceful lives of the clergy in the first half of the sixth century. . . . Severe, but not unmerited, was the judgment that was inflicted upon the Britons and their Church." So inveterate, moreover, was the hatred of the Britons towards the Saxon conquerors who punished them that when St. Augustine arrived, charged with a mission to convert the latter, as well as to reform the former, the British Bishops obstinately refused to coöperate with him.

As a result of Pope St. Gregory's mission, England, under St. Augustine and his successors, became in like manner as Ireland consequent upon Pope Celestine's mission, under St. Patrick and his successors, had become the "Island of Saints." More than eighty of her princes were numbered in her calendar, eight of her kings, in gratitude to the Vicar of Christ, went on pilgrimages to the shrine of the Apostles, and many more resigned their royalty to enter the cloister. Her clergy, by their intercourse and intimate relations with the clergy of Ireland, gained proficiency in learning, both scientific and theological, and from Ireland's cloister-schools

[1] Alzog, Univ. Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 43, transl.

went forth with them on missions to their own country and to the Continent. England had her own cloister-schools also, conspicuous among them Glastonbury, "the nursery of saints," and it was an Anglo-Saxon king who in the eighth century introduced the payment of Peter's Pence towards creating a permanent fund for the support of English ecclesiastical schools in Rome. And meanwhile the monastery of St. Columba on the island of Iona, consisting principally of Irish monks, long supplied missionaries to North Britain.

Britain and Ireland, "the Islands of the Saints," thus "had been both the refuge of Christianity, for a time almost exterminated in Christendom, and the centres of its propagation in countries still heathen. Secluded from the rest of Europe by the stormy waters in which they lay, they were converted just in time to be put in charge with the sacred treasures of revelation and of the learning of the Old World in that dreary time which intervened between Gregory and Charlemagne. They formed schools, collected libraries and supplied the Continent with preachers and teachers. While the English Boniface and his followers formed churches in Germany and towards the north, under the immediate sanction of the Holy See, the Irish Columbanus, the representative of an earlier age, became the rival of St. Benedict in France and Lombardy."[2]

But, as with the other countries of Europe, so, too, Britain's and Ireland's turns for invasion at length arrived. In 787 Northmen pirates arrived in Britain and in Ireland ten years later. The former island became their prey for two hundred and fifty years and the latter for a hundred longer. In both islands sanctity had declined, and though after a while both converted the invaders to Christianity, neither could make of them the civilized Normans that their kindred Northmen became by their contemporaneous settlement in France.

A hundred years after their invasion the great Alfred, after vanquishing, converted them, and during his reign and the century that followed it, in the absence of further invasion, his own and St. Dunstan's reforms did much to remedy the ignorance and corruption of morals that prevailed consequent upon the destruction of monasteries and schools. But there came a fresh invasion of Northmen, resulting in a return of the former disorders and in further demoralization of the Anglo-Saxon populations. Meanwhile there were saints, however, after as before Alfred's time, and these did much as missionaries to the Northmen, and still more as martyrs sent by them, in return, to their eternal reward.

[2] Newman's Hist. Sketches, Vol. III., p. 265.

The monarchy, too, did much for England; the Northmen broke up the heptarchy, Alfred became the first king of the English and Athelsbane, his grandson, the first king of England, as well as nominal lord of Wales and Scotland, and under this unity of governing power the Northmen, or Danes, as they are called, were subdued and in larger numbers were made Christians, without, however, being civilized and without acting in turn upon the demoralized Anglo-Saxon populations. That they failed, indeed, when made Christians to influence Anglo-Saxons, even as Anglo-Saxons failed to civilize them, is but too painfully apparent from the one fact, among many, that for a hundred and fifty years, from the reign of Ethelred, Anglo-Saxons sold their relations and even their own children into foreign slavery. There were bad kings also, such as was this Ethelred, who ordered the secret massacre of all the Danes in England on the eve of St. Brice's feast, 1002, concerning which Lingard writes: "The horror of the murder was in many places aggravated by every insult and barbarity which national hatred could suggest. At London they fled for security to the churches, and were massacred in crowds round the altars." And after so grievous a crime and exhibition of racial hatred, how was it to be expected that the hope of civilizing the Northmen lay any longer with the Anglo-Saxon race? These Northmen needed, indeed, their kindred Normans, civilized in Normandy, to confer civilization upon them, and the Anglo-Saxons needed them, too, for the like purpose.

If we turn to Ireland, we find that the Irish also, as the English under Alfred, had their deliverer from the Northmen invaders in the person of Brian Boroimhe. This King of Munster, after his predecessor had defeated the Northmen in three battles, reformed the laws and enforced their observance, rebuilt the churches and monasteries laid waste by the invaders, restored the public schools and added to their number, and then, in 1014, gained the famous battle of Clontarf, though at the cost of his own and of his son's life. And what he thus began the Irish carried forward. "After the complete overthrow of those barbarians, in 1014, in the battle of Clontarf," says McGeoghegan,[3] "the inhabitants began to rebuild their churches and public schools and to restore religion to its primitive splendor," and he adds: "From the battle of Clontarf to the reign of Henry II. about a century and a half elapsed, during which time all ranks were emulous in their endeavors to reëstablish good order in the government and discipline in the churches." Nevertheless, the Irish during these three and a half centuries failed to civilize the invaders. The chief of the Danish

[3] Quoted ibid., p. 277.

kings resided in Dublin, and the Dublin Danes were the first to embrace Christianity, not, however, until at the end of a hundred years after settling in the island. By the middle of the eleventh century the bulk of the Danes settled in Ireland were Christians and had a Bishop of their own, with his see in Dublin. So far from being civilized by their Irish neighbors, however, they continued still to war, not only upon them, but likewise upon one another. Thus Lanigan, after observing that the Danes of Dublin were the first of their kindred in Ireland to become Christians, adds, "which, however, did not prevent them afterwards practicing ravages in the same manner that their predecessors had done," and he further adds that though near two centuries after their arrival "a certain progress was made by the Danes in piety and religious practices, yet we find them now and then, even during this period, committing depradations in religious places." Elsewhere he explains that Ireland labored also under want of a central sovereign authority. "The anciently established system of succession to the throne of the whole kingdom was overturned, and there remained no paramount power authorized to control the provincial kings or minor chieftains. The Irish were during a great part of the eleventh century engaged here and there in wars among themselves, and we find now and then one or other party of them assisted by the Danes settled in Dublin or elsewhere." He shows, too, that so far from the Danes being influenced by the Irish, on the contrary, "several of the Irish princes and chieftains had imbibed the spirit of the Danes, sparing neither churches nor monasteries nor ecclesiastics, according as it suited their views, a system which was held in abhorrence by their ancestors and which had often excited them to unite in defense of their altars against the Scandinavian robbers." Added to all which "a very great antipathy existed between the two nations, even after the conversion of the Danes, and the Danish clergy of Dublin and the Irish clergy of Armagh were constantly at variance."[4]

It seems, then, but too evident, from the history of both the Anglo-Saxons and the Irish, that, edifying and full of promise as formerly had been their Christianity, both had lost their early fervor, and neither remained fitted to influence the other or to civilize their Northmen invaders. In Britain the Britons, through racial hatred of Anglo-Saxons, had refused coöperation with St. Gregory's mission to convert them, and the Anglo-Saxons in turn, as likewise the Irish, though converting, failed, by reason of racial antipathy, to unite with and civilize the Northmen. Their failures, after so long contact and intercourse, called for men of another

[4] Quoted ibid., pp. 304, 283, 285, 307.

nation and of a higher civilization to do for the Northmen, as likewise for the Anglo-Saxons and the Irish themselves, what none of these could do the one for the other. When the Normans at length came to England in 1066, they found that country sunk still in sloth and sensuality, and in 1171 they found Ireland still convulsed with conflict.

These Normans were the descendants of the Northmen who, contemporaneously with their invasion of Britain and Ireland and under the selfsame leaders, invaded France at the close of the eighth century, and their settlement in France had all along been contemporaneous with the settlement of their kindred in Britain and Ireland. But whereas the Northmen settled in these islands did not become Christians until long after their arrival, and, despite their subsequent Christianity, remained uncivilized, the Northmen settled in France, on the contrary, became Christians almost immediately on their arrival there, and in the course of a hundred and fifty years made such progress in the arts of civilization also that they became exemplars and teachers of discipline, manners and government to Christian populations of earlier conversion than themselves. Despite the traits that remained of their cruelty and lax morals, they were zealous for religion, and instead of destroying and plundering churches, as their kindred in Britain and Ireland so long continued to do, they caused an incredible number of churches and cloisters to be built. They became, in short, the chivalrous Normans, upon whose prowess, skill in politics, nobility and refinement, stately architecture, poetry and music, historians and writers of historical romance love to enlarge, and their French colony took from them and has ever retained the name of Normandy. Their history there is therefore a very different one to that of the contemporaneous history of their kindred in Britain and Ireland. The civilization which they found round about them in France did for them what neither Britain nor Ireland could do for their kindred. They became the foremost race in Christendom. Their conquests were carried from the northern seas to the further coasts of the Mediterranean. Norman princes ruled in Italy, Sicily and on the northern shore of Syria. They seized, indeed, upon portions of the patrimony of St. Peter also, but after defeating Pope Leo IX. and taking him prisoner, Robert Guiscard, their leader, fell at the Pope's feet, implored his pardon, promised amendment of his misdeeds and asked the Papal blessing on his future undertakings. Leo forgave him and made the Normans his allies, and they received from him in fief the lands which they had already conquered, together with such as they might prevail to obtain from the Saracens.

This same Pope meanwhile maintained friendly relations with Edward the Conqueror, King of England, and did all he could for the Church in England. Edward's mother was a daughter of a duke of Normandy. He had been educated at the Norman court and had spent twenty-seven years there. In the early years of his reign over England he had Normans about him whose influence prevailed at the English court; a Norman was Archbishop of Canterbury and Normans held office in the State as well as in the Church. They began also to build castles in the country. Thus when Duke William of Normandy, at Edward's request for aid against Godwin's revolt, came to England and was entertained at the English court, he heard Norman-French spoken, and, among other signs of Norman influence, saw Dover, Canterbury and other principal towns garrisoned by Normans. Things, indeed, seemed to be in course of preparation for his subsequent coming as Conqueror.

He came as such, with consecrated banner, from Pope Alexander II. Alexander had been elected by the Cardinals under the great Cardinal Hildebrand. His title to the Papacy was disputed by the Emperor, Henry IV. of Germany. The Normans took up arms in Alexander's defense. They were the protection of Hildebrand also, when, under the title of Gregory VII., he became Pope in succession to Alexander. It was the same Robert Guiscard, indeed, that had done homage to Pope Leo IX., who now marched on Rome while Henry was besieging the castle of St. Angelo, liberated the Pope, led him in triumph to the Lateran, and then, in like manner as he had done before Leo, fell at Gregory's feet and offered him gifts expressive of his dutiful fidelity.

Such incidents serve to indicate the relations in which the Popes and the Normans stood towards one another at this period, and there were none nearer or better qualified than the Normans of Normandy to whom to entrust the much-needed reform of England.

Under William of Normandy England became what it had not been before, a united realm. A new civilization was introduced. The Church, with increase of wealth, learning and zeal, enriched the country with noble cathedrals and churches, religious orders, scholars and statesmen. The Danes, as separate from their Norman kindred on the one side and from Anglo-Saxons on the other, are little more heard of, and though the racial distinctions between Anglo-Saxons and Normans lasted for more than two centuries, no historical event, such as a war or a serious insurrection, marks the Anglo-Saxons as a separate people after less than a fourth of that period of time.

In Ireland, meanwhile, the Danes continued as communities distinct from the Irish until the Normans arrived there in 1172. Immediately on their coming these Normans obtained over the Danes the influence which centuries of neighborhood and intercourse, as we have seen, had failed to give to the Irish. So great indeed was the attraction that the Northmen felt towards their kindred Normans that the Dublin Danes at once put themselves under the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, "because," as Lanigan explains, "William and his Normans, being masters of England from 1066, were considered by the Danes as their countrymen." The Danish Bishops of Waterford and Limerick were likewise consecrated from Canterbury. So completely, in short, do the Danes of Ireland appear to have been absorbed by the Normans that they forthwith disappear from the page of history.

Pope Adrian IV., who first countenanced the Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland, was an Englishman, indeed; but the invasion did not take place until Henry II. of England received a confirmatory Bull from Adrian's successor, Alexander III.

The districts occupied by the Anglo-Norman invaders were confined to a strip of country on the east coast, and designated the Pale, its boundaries varying with the fortunes of the Norman arms. Throughout the rest of Ireland the native princes continued to rule, recognizing an overlordship in the English kings subordinate to the Papacy.[5] But in addition to these native princes there were Anglo-Norman proprietors also, who lived as chieftains outside the Pale, adopted the Irish laws and customs, dress and language and became so attached to the Irish soil and united to the Irish people that, according to the proverb, they were *Hibernis hiberniores.* English endeavor sought, indeed, to subject them, together with the Irish chieftains, to English rule, but these "English rebels," as they came to be called, as likewise the "Irish enemies," as were designated the latter, long opposed the endeavor. Nevertheless, throughout the period of contention, Irish and Normans were alike so zealous for religion that in the course of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they founded between them nearly three hundred monasteries. And meanwhile nothing further was accomplished in relation to the conquest of Ireland, English overseas endeavors being devoted instead to conquests in France.

Before pursuing the subsequent history of Ireland it may be here observed by way of recapitulation that since both Britain and Ireland had been converted by the Holy See and had done so much for Christendom during a period in which their aid was sorely needed, it seemed incumbent upon the Popes to take action when

[5] Mosheim, Eccl. Hist., Vol. III., p. 109, and note, transl.

subsequently they needed restoration, and the Northmen after long settlement among them remained still separate and uncivilized. A remedy was needed for both islands, and it seemed fitting that one and the same remedy should be applied to both; that the Normans, near at hand, converted and civilized, fully equipped for the enterprise, and of the same stock as the Danes, or Northmen, should be sent to both islands to reform and unite them and to do for the Northmen what Anglo-Saxons and Irish alike had so signally failed to do. "The Northmen had been their bane, and, in the intention of the Pope, the Normans were to be the antidote."[6]

The temporal evils in which both islands were involved by the application of the remedy—evils attendant always in greater or less measure upon the process of conquest—were, of course, no part of the Pope's intention; nor were they, in whatever degree foreseen, to be weighed in the balance against the religious and civil advantages to be gained. It is remarkable, too, that despite the sufferings which the Irish have endured in consequence of the annexation of their country to the English crown, they never have attributed them to the action of the Pope, and, on the contrary, have ever remained devotedly loyal to him. They know, also only too well, that their most serious sufferings did not begin until in the sixteenth century the English monarchy broke with the Pope, and England under tyrannically imposed Protestantism became, and has ever since remained, in consequence of Irish refusal in like manner to apostatize, Ireland's most bitter oppressor and foe. They know well, from an experience more terrible than has been inflicted on any other people, that to Protestantism is due the barbarous oppression under which they suffered, almost without intermission, from the accession of Elizabeth of England until the end of the eighteenth century; that to Protestantism is due the cruel depopulations of vast tracts of their fair country and the plantings of their provinces instead with aliens alike in religion and in race; that to it is due that commercial invasion through three weary centuries which wrung from Grattan the well-known condemnation: "To find a worse government than the government of the English in Ireland you must go to hell for your policy and to bedlam for your discretion;" that the English Protestant government is responsible for the horrible atrocities of the suppression of the Irish rising of 1798; responsible also for the callous and cruel neglect of the indigent and starving Irish in the Black Famine of 1845 to 1848, despite the fact that in the first year of this potato famine £17,000,000 in wheat and cattle were exported to England —a famine resulting in the death by starvation of from one and a

[6] Cp. Newman's Hist. Sketches, Vol. III., p. 287.

half to two millions of Ireland's men, women and children and the migration of two millions more, packed as sardines in fetid steerages, subjected to sickness, starvation and, worst of all, to vile outrage by brutal and immoral crews upon Ireland's proverbially pure daughters. Little marvel, then, that some ten years later in the land of their migration an association of Irishmen was formed for the overthrow of the English government in Ireland. *Fianna Eirionn,* "champions of Erin," is the probable derivation of the appellation "Fenianism" given to it. And while certain acts in Ireland by individuals said to have belonged to it are, of course, to be reprobated, it should be remembered that to make savages of a people is to expect them to behave as savages. That such was both the expectation and the intention of English misgovernment in Ireland is shown by the historian Alzog, who observes that under Elizabeth and her successors a persecution, in the interests of Protestantism, was carried on against the Catholics of Ireland "so cold-blooded, systematic and atrocious that since the time of the Pharaohs the world has seen nothing comparable to it," and that "such, with the exception of short intervals of peace, occurring at long intervals, was the normal condition of Ireland for three centuries," and then adds: "To hold that country dependent on England, the people were kept in a chronic state of insurrection, and the ministers of Elizabeth did not attempt to conceal that they practiced so infamous a means for so iniquitous a purpose. When, goaded to desperation, the people rose in rebellion, they were put down by fire and sword, and the work of destruction was completed by the ravages of famine."[7] To attempt resistance, more especially in defense of the Catholic religion, was ruled as high treason, and was punished accordingly. And of the enactments of the reign of Queen Anne, the statesman Edmund Burke observes: "It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people and the debasement in them of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

"Go into the length and breadth of the world," exclaimed Gladstone in his endeavor to repair Ireland's wrongs; "ransack the literature of all countries, find if you can a single voice, a single book, in which the conduct of England towards Ireland is anywhere treated except with bitter and profound condemnation." And how is it to be expected that, after three centuries of such conduct, England, apostate still, and still impenitent, can hope to conciliate a people goaded by her to hatred of her name and race and

[7] Univ. Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 351, transl.

Protestant apostasy. No such expectation is to be met with outside of England. The expectation rather is that, since a nation is an ethical entity, and a Nemesis awaits the crimes of nations as surely as it does those of individual men, a Nemesis there must be in store for England, a payment of the penal debt accumulated through three centuries of persecution of Ireland, ere she can expect forgiveness and win Ireland's good will. Nor is it easy to see how this can be brought about save by England's humiliation, repentance and a return to her former faith and spiritual allegiance.

H. P. Russell.

Leamington Spa, England.

CURIOUS FUNERAL RITES AND BURIAL PLACES.

IN every country in the world and among all classes and conditions of men a deep interest has ever centred upon the ceremonies and rites of burial. Every nation and every age has had its own peculiar manner of disposing of its dead. Thus we find mummification among the Egyptians, incineration among the Greeks, Romans, Siamese and other nations of ancient times (and quite a revival of it in our own day and country), and interment in various forms and positions among these and other nations at different periods.

It was the custom among certain nomadic tribes to expose their dead to the ravages of the weather and to wild beasts, while the Kamtschatdales keep special dogs to consume their dead, under the belief that they who are eaten by dogs will enjoy the happiness of driving fine dogs in the other world. In some countries of Africa persons struck by lightning are deprived of sepulture and are hacked to pieces by the priests, who are supposed to eat them, while other tribes bury them on the spot where they fall.

Among the nations that practice interment we likewise find many strange customs, and much importance seems to be attached not only to the position in which the body is placed, but as to what point of the compass it faces. Sometimes we find the body laid out in the ground and heaps of stones piled over and around it to keep off the beasts of prey, while the Moors add prickly thorns to secure greater protection. Among some of the rudest tribes it was the custom to lay their dead in the hollow trunks of trees or in boats or to wrap them in the skins of animals. Some of the American Indians bury their children apart from adults and sometimes by the wayside, so that their souls may enter the bodies of persons passing by.

Embalming and drying dead bodies on trees or scaffolds erected for the purpose before burying them has been resorted to in regard to men; women were buried as they died. The Tondas burned all except children the victims of infanticide, whom they bury.

We have alluded to the various forms and positions in burial. Some place their dead in a recumbent position; others sitting; some facing the east and others the west, while others again, like the Bongos, bury men facing the north and women facing the south.

Nor are strange customs confined to the manner of burying the dead. They extend to the ceremonies incident to it. Even among primitive nations we find fasting, neglecting the hair, wearing rags or sackcloth, daubing the person with mud and an entire neglect of the usual comforts as signs of mourning, while sorrow, real or feigned, found expression in the wringing of hands, tearing the hair, shaving the head, beating the breast and the like. We find New Zealanders gashing themselves with broken shells and Hawaiians knocking out their teeth and cutting off a finger-joint or an ear. Among other peoples we find grief frequently manifested in singing lamentations, playing plaintive airs and dancing funeral dances. Customs of this kind prevail among the Irish peasantry, among Chilians, gypsies and even among the copper-colored natives of North and Central America.

The idea prevalent among all classes of people that death is a transition from this to another world has also given rise to many curious customs. The soul must be provided with necessaries while on that journey, hence meat, drink, weapons, musical instruments, medicines, light, money, horses, servants and even wives are among the things buried with the body. The Gonds are so dainty as to furnish their dead with a supply of toothpicks; the Aztecs gave them water bottles; the North American Indians included a kettle of provisions, bows and arrows, a pair of moccasins and even spare pieces of deerskin to patch them with. The Laplanders furnished the corpse with flint, steel and tinder to give it light for the dark journey; the ancient Mexicans gave their dead slips of paper to serve as passports, and the Greeks put an obolus in the dead man's mouth to pay Charon for ferrying him across the Stygian lake. Among the Greenlanders it was customary to bury a dog with the body of a child, that it might not be without a guide, the Greenlander believing that the dog can find his way anywhere. The Norse warrior insisted upon having his horse and armor buried with him, that he might ride to Valhalla with becoming dignity, and even among the Arabs it was at one time the custom to leave the dead man's camel to die upon his grave.

Human sacrifices have not been confined to any special class of

people. The Figians have been known to strangle wives, slaves and friends, that they might attend the deceased. Among the Japanese it was at one time the custom for twenty or thirty slaves to kill themselves by "hari-kari" to serve their dead masters in the other world, and the Quakeloths of North America were wont to lay the widow's head in the burning corpse and then drag her out half dead. How devoted wives must have been in those times and how anxious they must have been to prolong the lives of their liege lords! The natives of Dahomey kept up intercourse with the departed by killing a slave from time to time and sending his soul to carry news from the living.

The custom among the Hindoos of placing the wives and concubines of the dead man upon the funeral pile and of incinerating them with him is well known to all readers. As recently as 1843, on the death of Soonchet-Sing, uncle of the Cashmerian Maharajah, the *five hundred* wives which constituted his principal harem were *bureid alive* with his body at Ramnagar and *twenty-five* others that he had at Jummoo shared the same fate. In 1863 another similar immolation took place at the violent and mysterious death of Jowahir-Sing, the Maharajah's cousin. Thirty-two of his widows were consumed with the remains of their late husband. On another occasion a solitary widow is described by an English tourist as sitting on a funeral pile with her husband's head upon her lap. Seized with terror at the approach of the hissing flames, she sprang from the pile and sought to escape by flight, but the attending priests, horrified at her sacrilegious conduct, caught her and threw her back in the burning pile, where she perished, uttering screams that would have moved the hardest hearts to pity. Happily in our day the custom of incinerating widows has entirely disappeared wherever English rule prevails in Hindustan.

Funeral feasts prevail extensively in America, Asia and Africa and grow partly out of a desire to do honor to the dead and partly from a belief that the dead participate in the good cheer. They are not merely commemorative, but communion meals. The Naga tribes of Assam celebrated their funeral feasts monthly by laying food and drink on the graves of the departed. The Karens, while habitually making oblations, have also annual feasts for the dead, "at which they invite the spirits to eat and drink." The ancient Peruvians were wont from time to time to assemble the embalmed bodies of their dead Incas in the grand plaza at Quito to be feasted in company with the people.

The writer of this article spent a portion of his childhood in Cuba. Among his father's servants was a Congo Negro named Tomas. On one occasion, on the eve of a *Dia de los Finados* (eve

of All Souls), Tomas prevailed upon the child in question to place beside his bed before retiring for the night a plate of eatables of different kinds, which the Negro insisted would protect him against the wrath of evil spirits. The child complied with his request, but instead of going to sleep, watched for the spirits. When all was quiet and the bells of the neighboring churches had sounded the midnight hour a dark form appeared at the open window. After looking around cautiously it glided noiselessly to where the plate was awaiting the visit of the "perturbed spirit." In a moment the same dark form was silently gliding out through the window, when the child called out, *"Adios, Tomas."* It is needless to add that on the following morning when waiting on the breakfast table Tomas wore a very sober face and was very reticent on the question of spirits.

Funeral feasts are not confined to savage or ignorant races, for in England there is frequent mention of "funeral baked meats," and the Greeks burned meats upon the graves as offerings to the dead. In connection with funeral feasts were funeral games, which among the Greeks were chiefly horse races and among the Romans processions and mortal combats of gladiators around the funeral pile. These games were abolished by the Emperor Claudius in the year 47 of the Christian era.

Funeral orations were also in vogue among the Greeks and Romans over their dead when they were eminent for rank, great deeds and virtues. We read that Theopompus obtained a prize for the best funeral oration in praise of Mausolus, 253 B. C. Popilia was the first Roman lady of whom we have any record who had an oration pronounced at her funeral; it was delivered by her son Crasus, and Cicero tells us that Julius Cæsar did the like for his aunt Julia and for his wife. In Greece, according to Herodotus, Solon was the first who pronounced a funeral oration, 580 B. C., and if we go back to Scriptural times we find that David lamented over Saul and Jonathan, 1056 B. C., and over Abraham 1048 B. C. The custom prevails in several European countries to this day.

It would be an endless task to attempt to describe even the *strangest* of the customs and rites attending the disposal of the dead, and their history, interesting as it is, must be sought for in works far more elaborate and pretentious than the limits allotted to an article like this permit. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a few illustrations of funerals in our own day and among civilized and partly civilized nations.

Probably one of the most novel sights to an American would be a funeral procession on Lake Gmünden, in Upper Austria. The town is situated upon the lake and is surrounded by mountains. Access

from one place to another is found more readily by boats, hence religious and funeral processions are frequently seen upon the lake. The body of the deceased is taken from the house of death to the church, where the Requiem Mass is celebrated. The coffin is then covered with a pall and borne not to a hearse, but to a funeral barge, on which it is deposited with care. A crucifix is placed at the head of the coffin (the fashionable casket has not reached there yet). Following this barge are two more, side by side, one occupied by the clergy, the other by the mourning relatives of the deceased. These boats are distinguished by banners bearing religious devices. The friends of the bereaved family follow in other boats at respectful distances, and thus the solemn procession is rowed along the lakes, the clergy and faithful chanting appropriate hymns and their voices, echoing and reëchoing from mountain to mountain, find sympathetic responses among the sick or aged mountaineers who, unable to take part in the mournful procession, join it in spirit and, devoutly crossing themselves, fall upon their knees and recommend the departed soul to Divine mercy.

In France nearly every department has its own peculiar custom regarding funerals. In the larger cities the pomp attending them is measured by the means of the family of the deceased, but there is no country in the world, perhaps, where the dead is more thoroughly respected. Nothing but the mail van is allowed to break a funeral procession, no matter whether it be that of a prince or a pauper, and if a funeral happens to come upon a passing body of troops, they halt, open ranks and, no matter what may have been the social standing of the deceased, present arms until the funeral has passed.

If we pay a visit to the *Salle des Pompas Funebres,* in the coachman's dressing rooms we shall see them preparing for a funeral *de premiere;* we shall also see the "mutes" preparing for a funeral of the same kind. These "mutes" are to be found nearly all over the continent. They are employed by undertakers to act as assistants and pallbearers. They walk beside the hearse, where one is used, or they bear the coffin on their shoulders when it is not. Their dress varies with the country to which they belong and the age of the deceased. In France the costume is generally a black dress coat and black silk hat. In Spain and her colonies the "mutes" wear knee breeches, long hose, low shoes with buckles and *chapeaux.* If the deceased is an adult, the black is worn; if a child or very young person, the colors are light. They are preceded at funerals by a *commissaire,* who clears the way. In Holland the "mutes" wear black, with long white neckties and long, flowing cloaks.

In some parts of France it was the custom to place the coffin near the door of the house so as to be seen from the street, and it is

sometimes watched by "mutes" or *religieuses.* It is surrounded by black hangings, candles, etc. In country places the body is generally carried to the grave by friends who relieve one another at intervals along the way. I witnessed such a procession one morning at St. Etienne. The funeral procession left the church adjoining my hotel somewhat as follows: Priest, in cassock, surplice and beretta; acolytes, with candles and censor; chanters, one of whom carried a musical instrument with which to give the tone to the chanters; next came the peasant women carrying lighted candles, then the corpse borne on the shoulders of friends of the deceased; it was followed by two *religieuses,* the members of the family and the friends of the departed. Psalms were chanted on the way to the cemetery and the scene was quite impressive. The priest who attended the funeral was an old missionary who had spent the best years of his life on the mission in Texas and who was then chaplain at the Hospice de la Charité.

It is considered a breach of politeness for any one to remain in the room with the corpse when the family is taking leave of its dead or when the coffin is being closed forever. When the coffin is taken out of the house, especially in large towns or cities, the ladies alone enter the carriages; the gentlemen attend the funeral on foot, unless the distance to the cemetery is great; in this case they walk part of the way.

In Spanish countries, and especially in Spanish America, the corpse is decked out in its best and is exposed to public view, being placed in an open coffin on a bier four or five feet high and surrounded with lighted candles. Many of the old customs have been modified of late years. Among the more intelligent people the body is watched through the night by friends and relatives who relieve one another in reciting prayers for the repose of the departed. The watchers are supplied with refreshments, which are partaken of sparingly and with due respect for the occasion. If the deceased is a child or a young person, the bier is strewn with flowers and there is less solemnity among the watchers, but they never lose sight of the presence of death. Among the lower classes of the people the custom of watching and praying with the dead in many places degenerated into those "wakes" which were not to edification and which have become a thing of the past.

It may not be out of place to give a brief description of one or two South American "wakes." In one case we find a curious mingling of Christian and pagan forms. The candles, indicative of an ever-living faith, surround the form of a dead child on whose head is a wreath of roses, in sad contrast with the pale hue of death upon its face; be it remembered that there was an attempt made to

preserve the body by artificial means. In one corner of the room sits the *padre,* and near him sits a woman evidently not a gypsy like the inmates of the house, for she is devoutly saying her beads. On either side of these two figures we find a man playing a mandolin and another playing the castinets, while a number of men and women engage in dancing around the bier, beside which the mother is sitting overcome with grief. But the faces of the dancers are by no means cheerful; on the contrary, they wear a saddened look; the dance is one of the death dances referred to above.

Another "wake," also that of a child, appears to us who do not understand the customs of the people and the meaning of these customs as a jumble of inconsistencies. The corpse is arrayed in a most fantastic style, with ornamented cap and wings suggestive of the future state of baptized infants. A canopy is hung over the bier and candles and flowers are placed around it. The watchers are whiling away the time with song and mandolin, while a kind neighbor prepares refreshments for the assembled guests, who sit around engaged in conversation, but not in boisterousness. In Spanish countries the body is rarely kept in the house over twenty-four hours, and funerals are attended only by men, women never going beyond the house of mourning.

Besides the modes of disposing of the dead already described there is another that has grown very popular with a certain class of people in our day, who defend its practice from every point of view except the Christian.

Cremation or incineration was practiced by the Greeks and Romans to a great extent in former times. In Siam it was considered the only honorable means of disposing of the dead. Even Jews resorted to cremation in the Valley of Tophet in time of plague; indeed, we find it in almost general usage among the ancient nations, except among the Egyptians, who embalmed the bodies of their dead. In Judea the dead were buried in sepulchres, and the Chinese buried in the earth. In Greece incineration was considered most honorable and was denied to suicides, unteethed children and persons struck by lightning. In Rome, from the close of the Republic to the end of the fourth Christian century, burning on the pyre, or *rogus,* was the general rule.

There is some diversity of opinion as to the period of its adoption and disuse, for Marcobius tells us that it ceased in the reign of the younger Theodosius, while other writers describe the young Numa Pompelius in the vaults of the Temple of Ceres, at Cures, in Sabinia, standing before the urn which contained the ashes of his father, Tacius, and listening to the words of wisdom that were to guide his future career as they fell from the lips of Tulius, the High Priest of the Temple.

That the practice of cremation was very general may be judged from the urns of the ancients which have been found over so large a portion of the world that it seems difficult to determine to what particular country they belonged. After the battle of Sebastopol some British officers found vessels of this kind in the ground supposed to have contained the ashes of the besiegers of Troy. Nearly all the Romans of rank were cremated and their ashes preserved in beautifully decorated urns. These urns were generally deposited in vaults or in *columbaria* along the Via Appia. There is a statue of a Roman Emperor holding an urn containing his own ashes.

The funeral rites of the ancient Romans are not devoid of interest. The body was bathed in perfume, arrayed in rich garments and laid out on a couch strewed with flowers; the outer door of the house was shaded with branches of cypress, and, as Charon would not convey the departed spirit across the Styx without the payment of a fixed toll, a coin was placed in the mouth of the deceased to meet this demand. The funeral took place by torchlight and the body was borne by near friends and relatives on an open bier covered with the richest cloth. Lictors arrayed in black regulated the procession. If the deceased had been a soldier, the insignia of his rank was displayed and the corps to which he belonged marched with reversed arms. Before the corpse were carried images of the deceased and of his ancestors; then followed musicians and mourning women hired to sing his praises. Dancers and buffoons followed, one of whom attempted to represent the character of the dead man and to imitate his actions when alive. The family of the deceased followed the bier in deep mourning, the sons with their heads covered and the daughters unveiled and their hair disheveled. Magistrates and patricians attended without badges or ornaments, and the procession was closed with the freedmen of the deceased wearing the liberty cap. When the funeral pile was reached an oration was delivered by a friend (recall Mark Antony's oration over Cæsar) and the bier was placed upon the pyre raised in the form of an altar. The procession moved slowly around it to the sound of solemn music, and then the nearest relative advanced from the train with a lighted torch and set fire to the pile. Perfumes and spices were thrown into the flames and the embers were quenched with wine. The ashes were collected and placed in a costly urn, which was deposited in the family sepulchre. In the case of a soldier his arms and the spoils he had won from the enemy were sometimes consumed with his remains.

II. TOMBS AND CATACOMBS.

Next to the study of the manner of disposing of the dead we are naturally led to the study of the means resorted to in different climes

and ages for the preservation of their remains and for the perpetuation of their memory. That burial out of sight was the original mode of disposing of the dead there can be no doubt, for we find Abraham bargaining with the sons of Heth for "a possession of a burial place" that he "may bury his dead wife out of sight." We see also that a cave in the field of Machpelah was "*made sure* unto Abraham" for that purpose.

The general tendency of mankind has always been to bury its dead out of sight of the living, and the various methods for the accomplishment of this may be summed up as follows: The simple closing up of the body in earth or stone; the burning of the body and the entombing of the ashes, and the embalming of the body. From burying in isolated places, as practiced by migratory tribes, came the custom of designating certain places for general burial, hence the cemetery or elisium, a place of rest. The first cemetery of which we have any mention was in Egypt, and was situated on the banks of a romantic lake called Aberyusia, which name signified the last state of man. The cemetery was called the Eliseum. It may be well to add while referring to the cemetery that it was not open to every one. A committee of forty-two judges sat upon the body, and if in their judgment the deceased was not of good character, he was sent down the river to a common ditch caller Tartarus, hence the "gloomy Tartarus" in mythology. If the deceased died insolvent, his body was given to his creditors, who kept it until it was ransomed. The committee was no respecter of persons, and even Kings have been refused admittance to this cemetery.

The tomb, the abiding place of the departed, in time came to be modeled after the abode of the living. The early dwellings of the living were either caves burrowed in the earth or the crevices of rocks; so, too, the first tombs were excavations. Such we find them in ancient Egypt, while the ledges of rock which skirt the Valley of the Nile are pigeonholed with roct-cut tombs in the vicinity of the great cities, especially the more ancient. The same may be said of a large part of Syria, while in Upper Egypt,* Etruria and Sicily these cities of the dead are even laid out in streets like those of the living.

The tomb, too, in the course of time was made to resemble, in its structural form at least, the chambers of the living. The grave was dug out and sometimes walled in and generally covered with a mound of earth not only for protection, but to hide the relics, or rather the valuable objects it was customary in those times to inter with the dead (that they might want for nothing during the journey

*Under the direction of the late Cardinal Lavigerie explorations were made among the ruins of Carthage, and the discoveries made in the old cemeteries of inscriptions, etc., are of intense interest to the archæologist.

from time to eternity) from hostile tribes. That this custom prevailed to a very great extent is amply attested to even in this day by the countless tumuli to be found not only in India and Ireland, but likewise along the banks of the Ohio and the Mississippi. From the shores of Lake Erie, where they are scarcely discernible, these tumuli generally increase in size until they rise up to the colossal heights of the pyramids of Anahuac and Tolteca. In Ionia, Etruria and Greece the tumulus is found rising gradually to monumental magnificence.

In the earlier days of Greece and Rome the custom of keeping the dead in the house prevailed for a long time, as Servius tells us, and it is well known that the Egyptians were wont to preserve the embalmed bodies of their departed ones with affectionate care in their own houses. This custom was not calculated to become either universal or lasting, as however spacious private dwellings might be, there would in time be no room for the living. The dead therefore passed from the home to the temple. Indeed, the temple is the outgrowth of the tomb, for Eusibius and Lactantius both tell us that such was the religious care the ancients bestowed upon their tombs that they became temples and holy places. Indeed, the religion of the tomb was regarded as something so holy that greater care was taken of the habitations of the dead than of those of the living, and they were guarded with jealous care against desecration. According to Roman law, the place in which a man was buried was sacred (*ubi corpus de mortui hominis candas, saecer est*), and it was considered desecrated by the interment of a stranger, of an unworthy member of the family or by demolition or degradation of the tomb. Permission to make repairs was granted solely on condition that the ashes of the dead should not be disturbed. The violation of a tomb was punishable by condemnation to the galleys, fustigation and having the hands cut off.

However interesting the history of the tomb may be, we have neither time nor space to follow it up in this article, except, perhaps, in so far as it refers to certain particular places of sepulture, and then only in the briefest manner.

The most primitive burial places in our time are to be found probably among the American Indians. Here we find platform graves, tree-burial and dead-houses. Among the Sioux may be seen child-graves hanging from the branches of tall trees and over the waters of placid streams. On the banks of these streams at times may be seen hungry wolves, drawn thither no doubt by the odor of decomposition, and looking wistfully at the swinging cradle.

In sequestrated valleys near rivers the traveler sometimes comes

across the elevated platform tombs of the Sioux. The bodies are wrapped in bark and the skins of beasts and propped up on stilts at different elevations and securely fastened to the trunks of trees, while near the corpse hangs the never failing wooden dish to enable it to quench its thirst while on its long journey; the moon shines down upon the silent scene, disturbed only, perhaps, by the shrill hoot of the solitary owl that keeps watch from the treetop. The Northwestern Indians, like the savages of the upper plateau of Laos, India, build houses for their dead and surround them with everything necessary for comfort and defense against the depredations of wild beasts. In some cases long sharp thorns are placed around and over the houses and platforms of the abodes or around the trees to which the dead are fastened. Poles are placed in an upright position and sometimes crosspoles extending between them, on which are hung the funeral gifts which remain with the dead. Among the Mandans the dead are placed on a slight scaffold, as already described, some seven feet high, and there left to decay. When in the process of time the scaffold gives way and falls, the relatives bury the remains of the deceased, with the exception of the skull, which they place on the ground, forming circles of a hundred or more, all with the faces looking inward and all resting on fresh bunches of herbs. A little mound is piled up in the centre of each circle, in which is placed the skulls of the male and female bison, and on the mound is placed a long pole, on which hang sundry "medicine" articles which are supposed to aid in guarding the remains of the dead. These skull-circles are constantly visited by relatives, and mothers will sit for hours together by the skulls of their children, going on with their work and talking to them as if they were living.

The Chinnooks place their dead in canoes, the warrior's arms and utensils always accompanying him. The custom of burying the widow of the deceased with them at one time prevailed to some extent among the American Indians, and there is a case on record in which the young sweetheart of a Natchez chief voluntarily offered herself to be strangled with his wives, that she might share his grave. The reader cannot fail to notice the similarity between this North American custom of strangling wives and the well-known Suttee (or Sutty) of India. The same custom prevails among the Fijians. In most cases the women are foremost in demanding death, and the Fijian wife goes so far as to help dig her own grave, lines it with mats and then seats herself in it.

The custom of tree-burial is not confined to the American Indians; it also prevails in Australia, in some parts of which the natives, instead of burning the body or hiding it in caves or in graves,

make it a conspicuous object. Lying in its canoe-coffin and so covered over with leaves and grass as to leave its shape clearly discernible, the body is lifted into a convenient fork of a tree and lashed to the boughs by native ropes.

Platform and shed burial is practiced in the Society Islands. Among the Tahitians the bodies of ordinary chiefs are laid out under the protection of a covered shed. The chief mourner wears an extraordinary dress, described as being "composed in the most ingenious manner of mother-of-pearl, feathers, bark cloth and similar materials, and has a peculiarly startling appearance from the contrast between the glittering white of the pearl shell and the dark feathers with which the shell is surrounded." The *tupapau* is a building in which the bodies of the chiefs are exhibited when lying in state. They are surrounded with palisades and are profusely decorated with scarlet feathers, cloth and other precious ornaments. Men are detailed to the *tupapau* to watch over it night and day, attend to the proper arrangement of the cloth and feathers, receive the offerings of fruit and provisions that are constantly made and prevent intruders from venturing within the palisades.

The custom of burying the dead in a crouched position prevails among the aboriginal inhabitants of South America. The Mapuche chief of Araucunia (Chile) when dead is bound with the knees to the breast and lowered into the grave facing the west, the direction of the Mapuche spiritland. The saddle, bridle, spurs and stirrups of the deceased are laid by his side, together with some provisions for the journey, a few beads and a piece of money and the grave is filled up. It may be well to state in this connection that as the chief's horse accoutrements are of silver and valuable they are represented by wooden copies, which are supposed to answer all the requirements of the dead chief, while the genuine articles become the property of his successor. At the head of the grave is planted the dead man's lance, the steel head of which is replaced by one of wood. Usage requires that a horse be sacrificed with the dead chief, and it is very likely that a wooden one would be substituted were it not that the Mapuches are very fond of horseflesh. A grand banquet is had and the skin (which is afterward stuffed and placed on four sticks near the grave) and the "spirit" of the horse are the only portions appropriated to the dead chief. The crouched position is also peculiar to the Peruvian tribes. The dead chief is decked out in all the feathers and other paraphernalia peculiar to his station, and with sceptre in hand he is crouched up in an antenatal position and placed in a womb-shaped urn, indicative of his new birth to an immortal life.

The Wallachians bury their dead in graves very much after the

manner of our own people; the earth is mounded over the grave, at the head of which a small lamp, in form not unlike those found in the Roman catacombs, is kept lighted as an emblem of the immortality of the soul.

The Parsees, or Fire Worshippers, do not seem to have any more regard for the fate of their dead than the Australians or some of the American Indians. They carry the bodies of their departed to their "Towers of Silence," within which is a house of prayer for those attending the funeral and a temple in which a sacred fire is kept burning. "The corpse of a deceased Parsee," says a writer in a Bombay paper, "clothed in white, is carried in an open bier covered with white cloth; the male relatives, all clothed in white, follow in pairs, each pair holding a handkerchief between them. Some prayers having been said in the rest-house, the body is again taken up and carried to one of the towers. At a distance of thirty feet from the ground there is a door in the wall through which the corpse-bearers push the body, and then, entering themselves, place it in the appointed place. The interior of each tower, which is open to the sky, is covered at an elevation of twenty-five feet from the ground, with a circular flooring which slopes downward on all sides to the centre and contains numerous open graves or receptacles for the bodies." The outer circle of the flooring is reserved for the bodies of men, the second for those of women, and the third or innermost for those of children. As soon as the bodies are deposited in their places the bearers retire and immediately swarms of vultures, which are continually sitting in dozens upon the tops of the walls, swoop down upon the body and inside of two hours strip it of every particle of flesh. In a few days the corpse-bearers return and, collecting the bones which are then dried, place them on a central wall to be decomposed by air and rain.

In Turkey the places and rites of sepulture have an affecting prominence and solemnity connected with them which is only equaled in Christian lands. As a rule, the dead are interred in very spacious cemeteries adjoining the towns and villages. They appear to be two cities placed side by side—the city of the living and the city of the dead, the population of the latter far exceeding that of the former. Turkish cemeteries may be recognized at a distance by the lofty and sombre phalanx of cypress trees, which are always the favorite attendants on Turkish graves. The immense burial grounds of the Turks on the Asiatic side of Constantinople have been much and favorably commented upon by travelers. The eye beholds to a wide extent stone after stone rising over innumerable graves, while thick spreading trees spread their branches and their shade over them. While contemplating this scene a silent awe pervades the mind and

the feeling is increased by the arrival of bodies to be deposited by the side of their friends and relatives. In some places we see female figures mourning over the last earthly abode of a husband, a father or a friend, while in others men are seen prone upon the ground in the attitude of prayer. At an anniversary feast in a Turkish cemetery the tombs of the dead and the tents of the living are decorated with cypress branches. The young and the old are gathered around the tombs of the loved ones and meat and drink are spread out upon them to be partaken of according to the prescribed ritual. The idea of making the grave-heap an altar on which offerings of food for the departed may be placed is not by any means confined to the teachings of the Koran. It prevails among the lower races in their ghost propitiation, and the "survivals" of such customs have been traced among highly civilized nations of modern times. It prevailed among the ancient Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans, the ancient Mexicans and the Chinese. The Parsees were required to render their *afringans* (chasings), which were to be recited over a meal to which an angel or spirit of a deceased person was invited at each of the six seasons of their year, and also on certain other days. The early Christians in the catacombs were wont to partake of meals upon the tombs of those who died martyrs to their holy faith, and when the days of persecution had passed away they loved to gather the relics of the martyrs and place them under the altars upon which the Eucharistic Sacrifice was offered up.

We cannot dismiss this subject—the homes of the dead—though far from being exhausted, without giving a few moments' consideration to the catacombs. It was our good fortune to be permitted on one occasion to wander among the Roman catacombs and to look upon the resting places of some of God's holy martyrs, and the impressions produced by these visits are still vividly impressed upon our memory.

The catacombs, as is well known, consist of labyrinths of subterranean galleries crossing one another in different directions and here and there opening into chambers more or less lofty and spacious.

The entire chain of mountains near Thebes, in Egypt, is mined by tombs some four thousand years old. They occupy a deep ravine in the centre of the Mountain Libycus and lying some distance from the banks of the Nile. These tombs were reached by an artificial passage. All the sarcophagi of the Kings have long since been violated, but they still preserve their wonderful paintings, in which the entire history of ancient Egypt may be read. Every action of the lives of the Egyptian rulers is here represented, with the furniture they used and even the playthings of their chil-

dren. The catacombs for the poor were limited, rude and unadorned, and the mummies were packed together as close as they could be laid, leaving a narrow passage between the wall of bodies.

The best known catacombs of our day are to be found in Syracuse, Malta, Paris and Rome. The Paris catacombs, the excavations of which are estimated to extend over an area of 3,000,000 square metres, were originally quarries worked as far back as the Roman period and yielding a soft kind of limestone, which hardened on exposure to the air. These subterranean galleries extended under a very large part of the city and at one time threatened to engulf several streets. They were very ingeniously propped up, however, named after the streets above them and opened up by sixty different entrances to the surface. These catacombs were not devoted to sepulchral purposes until 1784, when the Conseil d'État issued a decree for closing the Cemetery of the Holy Innocents and for removing the contents, as well as those of other burial places, to the quarries beneath the southern part of Paris. During the Revolution and the Reign of Terror the remains of the countless dead were thrown in confused masses into these cavities, the only order observed being that those from each cemetery were kept separate. In 1810 a regular system of arranging them was begun and subsequently carried out. Partitions were made, a plentiful supply of air was admitted and ditches were dug to carry off the water. The galleries and apartments are now artistically lined with human bones carefully assorted and intermingled with skulls. Even chapels are made of these ghastly materials and furnished with inscriptions. It is estimated that the remains of at least 3,000,000 human beings are ranged along the walls of the Paris catacombs. No bodies are interred there now.

The most interesting and best known catacombs are those of Rome. They attract attention because they were originally the homes as well as the burial places of the early Christians. We shall never forget our visit to the Catacombs of St. Agnes and St. Calixtus, but we shall have to defer any reference to it until some future occasion. It would take a large volume to give even a brief description of subterranean Rome. Nor are the venerated dead confined within these vast precincts. The city of Rome is one vast cemetery. The vaults of its church are filled with the bones of martyrs and saints. In the crypt of St. Peter's besides the tombs of apostles are the remains of nearly all the Popes. The distinguished Irishmen, O'Neill and O'Donnell, rest in San Pietro, in Montorio, while the heart of O'Connell, the great "agitator," is in the shrine of St. Agatha. Casket Angelo was once (A. D. 130) the mausoleum of the Emperor Hadrian. Along the Via Appia we find the tomb of

Cecilia Metella, erected some 2,000 years ago by Crassus in memory of his wife. Near the Porta San Paolo is the tomb or pyramid of Cestius, 125 feet high and 100 feet wide at the base, with walls 25 feet thick. The interior contains vast burial chambers, the inner walls of which are covered with paintings. Cicero tells us that Cestius, who was very wealthy, left a large sum of money for the erection of this monument to himself.

There are many tombs in our own country and in Europe to which we might refer if space permitted. We might point out the tomb of Washington at Mount Vernon and wonder why a spot so sacred to the American mind remained so long neglected. We might go to the Riverside Drive, New York, and admire the costly mausoleum raised to the memory of General Grant; we might contemplate the simple slab that covers the remains of Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia, or the monument that marks the last resting place of Edgar A. Poe in Baltimore. We might take the reader through Westminster Abbey and describe the tombs of St. Edward the Confessor, the Crusaders, the unfortunate Mary Stuart, the Earl of Chatham, Ben Jonson, Milton, Sir Isaac Newton and a host of others. We might go, too, to Père-la Chaise, in Paris, and wander among the tombs of Lafontaine, Molière, Beranger, Sydney Smith, Macdonald, Junot, Grouchy, Talma, Rachel, Marshal Ney, Abelard and Heloise and of many other characters famous in history, but we have said enough, we hope, to awaken the reader's interest and lead him to seek further information concerning tombs and catacombs in more pretentious works.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

MARC F. VALLETTE.

ART AND GOD.

I.

THE FATHER.

WE sometimes hear it said that it is unlawful to represent God the Father in human form in art. Judging by the rarity of the representations of the First Divine Person, we might be tempted to believe this was an explanation of the phenomenon. Certain it is that throughout the early centuries of Christianity, even on through the Middle Ages, God the Father was either not represented or given only a secondary position; God the Son occupies the whole foreground of early Christian art; next in importance is His Mother. An instance of this is to be seen in the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris. Jesus and His Mother are everywhere; over the central door Christ sits in judgment; on the right door He is a babe on His Mother's knee; on the left door He is a man, attending His dying Mother; above this again He is seen crowning her. In like manner throughout the Cathedral the life of Jesus is represented in detail; He is the centre point on which all other decorations are focused. The Father appears only once, and then but partially; in the Gethsemane scene the hand and face of God appear as Jesus says: "If it be Thy will, take this chalice from Me." Such, then, is the treattment of the Father in art as late as the thirteenth century. The First Person is sometimes rendered even ridiculous, hateful or cruel, beating men with His fists and driving them with arrows, just as we read of the pagan Apollo.

How, then, are we to account for this strange treatment of that tender Father who has numbered all the hairs of our heads, who clothes even the lily and feeds the raven? Are we to blame the early artists and bless those of our own day? We will probably be safe in saying that both are to blame and both merit benediction.

There are several reasons to account for the apparently ungenerous treatment of the Father in the early ages. In the first place, we have the influence of the widespread Gnostic heresy. This sect believed that the God of the Old Testament was not their true God; that He was too rigorous a master. How could an all-loving Father condemn all mankind for one man's original sin, destroy mankind by the deluge, slay the murmuring Israelites in the desert and cause the death of 70,000 of them merely to punish David for his pride? The great law-giver, Moses, the "meekest of men," forestalls the Gnostics when he reminds the Jews that God had

"kept them as the apple of His eye;" that He had taken them on His back, as the eagle does her young. Moses seems even to challenge the Gnostics when he exclaims: "Oh, that they were wise! that they understood this; that they would consider their latter end." (Deut. xxxii., 29.) In hatred of Jehovah these heretics denounced the Father as the archenemy of Jesus, who had contrived to make Him die on the Cross through jealousy of Him; they shattered His images and everywhere set up that of their only true God, Jesus. A branch of this sect adored the serpent; for this reason they were known as Ophites (Greek "ophis," a serpent). According to this branch, the serpent was a friend of mankind and sought to teach true wisdom to Adam, but was caught in the act by the great enemy of man—Jaldabaoth, or God. One branch of Gnostics went by the name of Cainites and reverenced Cain, together with all those whom Jehovah had punished, including the Cities of the Plain. Such, then, was the negative influence of Gnosticism; its positive effects on art are most far-reaching, and are felt even at this day. To replace Jehovah, the First Person, the Gnostics consistently set up images of Jesus and His Mother; where the Gospel records failed them they derived ideas and incidents from a host of writings called apocryphal gospels (and epistles). So great was their zeal in this direction that one learned antiquarian, M. Rochette, has proved all the early images of Christ, His Mother and His chief Apostles to be Gnostic fabrications. Their traditions were uniformly discredited by the Church; Popes, doctors and historians from Pope Gelasius I., in the fifth century, to Paul IV., in the sixteenth, have consistently exerted their authority against these legendary books. Yet many of our greatest cathedrals are decorated with scenes taken entirely from these sources.

A cause acting side by side with the Gnostic hatred of the Father was the natural dread of Christians lest the images of God should be confounded with those of Jupiter, the pagan "father of gods and men." Such an error might conceivably lead to the continuance of a species of idolatry among ignorant converts to the early Church. We have only to recall the fury of the iconoclasts of the Eastern Church from the eighth century onwards, which is perpetuated by the absence of images of any kind on the coinage and post office stamps of the Turkish Empire, whilst the outbreak of Puritan zeal in these our own parts shows even more clearly how ready misguided Christians are to misinterpret the homage paid to sacred images. Had the early Christians tried to depict the Father, they would have found it hard to invent some model other than the most majestic, awe-inspiring and often

lovable Jupiter. Hence they thought it more prudent not to attempt the delineation of the First Person.

A further reason for omitting the Father from art was found in the fact that various texts of Scripture seem to point to an identity of appearance in the two Persons: *e. g.*, "He that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent Me." (St. John xii., 45.) "I and the Father are one." (St. John x., 30.) For this reason Christ is often seen representing the Father, "the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature." (Colossians i., 15.)

The chief of these texts is that of St. John: "The Word was made flesh." (i., 14.) Wherever God speaks, it is the Word that really acts. Genesis tells us that God created everything by His Word. The Nicene Creed bears this out when it says, "And in Jesus Christ, unbegotten Son of God . . . through whom all things were made." Theologically then, the ancient artists were correct in not representing God; historically they were at fault in representing Christ, as man, performing acts that occurred before He became man.

We must bear in mind that no one had ever seen God's countenance. In the Book of Exodus we read: "No man shall see Me and live." St. John Damascene, the great apologist of images, does not encourage representations of the Father.

A final reason why God was not represented by early artists was that they felt unequal to such a conception. Even Jesus Christ is inadequately represented by the greatest artists of later times. Many painters from the Renaissance downwards have represented the Father, but we feel they fall infinitely short of the mark. However, they uniformly present one lovable characteristic, that of the all-embracing tenderness of a venerable parent.

We now pass on to the treatment of the Father in greater detail. Previous to the eleventh century the presence of the Father was indicated only by a hand appearing through the clouds, either in the act of blessing or presenting a crown. No other Divine Person is thus represented. In this connection it is interesting to remark the difference between the form of benediction in the Greek and in the Latin Church. In the latter, as we know from our representations of the Pope, the thumb and first two figures are extended, the last two fingers being closed over, but in the Greek Church the blessing is different; the first finger is straight, the second curved, the third slightly curved and crossed by the thumb, whilst the little finger is curved like the second. The interpretation is curious: the straight forefinger represents the letter I, the next finger is C (the Greek S), the third finger and thumb are crossed to form X and the small finger again forms C. Thus we have I-C X-C, Jesus Christus.

In the twelfth century the Father's face appears, but it is hard to recognize it with certainty, unless the Son and Holy Ghost are present also. Even as far as the fourteenth century it is hard to recognize the Father, but after that period the treatment of Him becomes more precise. God now appears in full bodily form, and is distinguished in various ways. In defiance of the doctrine that Father and Son were co-eternal, art found it more convenient to represent the Father as a generation older than the Son. The Holy Ghost is represented either as a youth or as a dove, but of that later. Artists sought some expression to symbolize the sovereignty of the Father, and the result was that He became commonly represented as Pope, Emperor and King. In Italy the Papal form is commonest, in Germany that of emperor, and in Spain, France and England that of king, as embodying the form of government in these respective countries, but the treatment varies and the forms are interchanged; for instance, in France, in convents and other ultramontane establishments, the Papal form was popular. Lest the figure of the Pope with his three crowns should not be majestic enough, we find the Father commonly represented as wearing five crown, with the circular nimbus behind the head. In France in the fifteenth century the divine image became somewhat vulgarized by ignoble artists, and it was like a second spring to the artistic world when Raphael, Michelangelo and their contemporaries in Italy threw their majestic conceptions upon wall and canvas. From this time forward the First Person was presented as a sweet-faced venerable father, leaning forth amid clouds of glory and encircled by enraptured cherubim. Perhaps no more familiar instance of this treatment can be cited than the glowing "Assumption" by Titian at Venice. About this period also there appears the representation of God on tabernacles and other sacred objects, copes, etc., under the old Hebrew form of of Tetragrammaton. The four Hebrew letters, J. H. V. H., are seen encircled by a nimbus with rays bursting from it, thus representing "Jehovah," the old name of God.

Such, then, is the strange record of the Father's artistic history. Whether we moderns are right in representing Him in bodily form is a little questionable. Yet we feel that art has achieved a noble work in attempting to supply us with some image—immeasurably faint though it be—of the all-majestic, all-powerful, yet all-loving Father.

II.

CHRIST IN ART.

We have seen that, on the one hand, the Gnostic heresy and Jewish tradition had combined to exclude the First Divine Person

from art, whilst, on the other, man's impotence in the face of such majesty and the fear of idolatry had equally checked all early efforts to represent the Father. No such arguments had any force in the case of Jesus; on the one hand, the Gnostics loved Him as the sole true God; on the other, the majesty of Jesus was, by the Incarnation, made palpable to human eyes, and, moreover, Jesus could be represented in a manner that had no prototype in pagan iconography, for no pagan deity was worshiped as a good shepherd, a lamb, even less as expiring on a cross of agony.

It has been already remarked, in speaking of the Father, that the Gnostics were responsible for much of the love that centred round the Man-God and His Mother. It was they who spread abroad the apocryphal writings so often condemned by the Church. They claimed the possession of portraits of Christ painted in His own time, even (as in the case of St. Veronica) miraculous portraits which Christ produced on pieecs of linen by applying them to His sacred face. Now, it would be rash to say that Christ's features were not well known and spoken of by the early Christians. Sixty years after his Master's death St. John must, for one, have been listened to with loving awe as he spoke of the Lord that loved him. Legend tells us that the tears wore furrows down St. Peter's cheeks, so often did he think of that one tender glance that the dear face bestowed on him as Jesus crossed the courtyard that last Maundy Thursday night, when Peter (Oh, how mean he felt!) was trying to save his face by saying, "I know not the man." Must not Peter have often told his faithful band in Rome, with glistening eyes, of the sweetness of Christ's face? We cannot for one moment doubt that Christ's features were not well known among the first Christians; besides, we must remember that the world abounded in artists with ability to reproduce the sacred countenance.

The earliest description of Christ is apocryphal, but we must attach the greatest importance to it, as so many of the ancient fathers refer to it. It is a pen-portrait sent by the Proconsul of Judea, Publius Lentulus, to Rome; his words may be thus translated: "At this time there appeared a man, who still lives, of great power, His name being Jesus Christ. Men call Him a great prophet; His Disciples call Him Son of God. He raises the dead to life and cures the sick of all kinds of ailments and diseases. He is a man of lofty stature and well-proportioned, and the look of His countenance is firm and full of power, so that those who behold it may both love and fear. The hairs of his head are wine-colored, straight and without radiance from the top of the head to the base of the ears; from this point to the shoulders they are

curled and glossy; from the shoulders they flow down the back, divided into two tails after the manner of the Nazarenes. His brow is clear and smooth; His face unblemished and graced with a slight ruddiness; His whole appearance is noble and pleasing. His nose and mouth are absolutely faultless. He has a full beard, forked and of the color of His hair. His eyes are blue and extremely bright. He inspires fear in reproving and censuring; in instructing and encouraging He is winsome and amiable. His countenance is grave and marvelously beautiful. No one saw Him laugh so much as once, but often cry. His body is slender, His hands straight and long, His arms graceful. He is deliberate and grave in His words and rarely speaks. He is the most beautiful of human kind."

This document held its full force in the eighth century, when St. John Damascene wrote; he was a firm believer in the beauty of Christ. This saint maintained that Jesus had all the beauty of Mary—"like unto us in all things except sin," which is the cause of human disfigurement; He was thus a reproduction of the first parent, and indeed the fathers constantly speak of Him as "Adam." In the ninth century St. Anschaire, Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, saw Christ in a vision, and describes Him almost exactly in accordance with the description by Lentulus above quoted. He remarks particularly the brightness of the eyes.

It is not to our purpose to examine the early portraits of Christ to see if they tally with this description; to our mind such a scrutiny is useless, for every tiro knows that after the first three or four centuries, when the barbarians descended on Italy, art perished in the general overthrow. Certainly after the seventh century, until the revival in the thirteenth, there was not an artist in Europe capable of doing justice to human beauty, much less divine. It is useless to say they could do it, but did not choose to do so; this has been asserted, but it is the merest fancy. Hence we need not lose time in looking for exact portraits of the Man-God on our mediæval monuments and manuscripts. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with remarking on a few peculiarities in the treatment of Christ in the Middle Ages.

In the first place, a contest had raged from patristic times round the question of Christ's beauty as man. The Christians of Asia and Africa held that by His Incarnation Jesus discarded all beauty, thus interpreting St. Paul's words: "[He] emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant," etc., and again the words of the Prophet Isaias: "There is no form nor comeliness in Him," etc. The Latin Church, on the contrary, counted Jesus the most beautiful of men; His Incarnation sullied Him no more than impure

glass can sully the sunbeam; the Apostles cured the sick, the leprous and deformed and were yet themselves whole; why, then, should Jesus be blemished because He took our infirmities upon Himself? The words of Isaias, "He was bruised for our iniquities . : . and with His stripes we are healed," have no reference whatsoever to the beauty of Christ during life, but only to that poor mangled body of His when it was "delivered up to be scourged and crucified."

This view of the African Christians, nevertheless, had its influence on the canons of iconography; it became a general rule to attempt to depict Christ as ugly or plain when acting as man, but ideally beautiful when rising from the dead or enthroned as God. It is curious to observe how this effect was obtained; a beard was always looked upon as something ugly, and so, to represent the *Man*-God (whom St. Cyril of Alexandria calls the most ugly of the children of men), Jesus was depicted wearing a beard. As God, triumphant over sin and death and sitting in glory, He was beardless. A good instance of this rule, amounting practically to a proof, is to be seen on the covers of a twelfth century Bible in the Royal Library at Paris. On the upper cover Christ is hanging on the Cross, bearded; on the end cover He is enthroned in glory, unbearded. The discussion about Christ's human beauty or ugliness ceased about the twelfth century, and with the Renaissance the influence of the question on art ceased to be felt. From the fifteenth century onwards Christ has been uniformly bearded, in accordance with the description of Lentulus. As regards beauty, we are safe in saying that all artists since then without exception have made Jesus their ideal. St. John the Evangelist sometimes surpasses Him, but St. John had the advantage of greater youth. Certainly all the power of art was called into play to represent, in some faint way, the dual nature of Christ, the human and the divine; art has failed, because all human thought itself must fail in contemplating such a subject. Beato Angelico, Da Vinci and Raphael reached a perfection almost approaching vision. It may not be out of place to note a peculiar error of taste on the part of Michelangelo, who was painting when art was rapidly on the decline, and who will be found, when the influence of Humanism becomes less and less felt, to have sinned greatly against the canons of Christian art. It is, of course, impertinent to question the genius of such a man, master as he was of all the arts—painting, sculpture, architecture, music, poetry and of the science of mathematics. But there is one curious error in his representation of Christ in the famous "Last Judgment" in the Sistine Chapel at the Vatican. The Christ here shown is an attempt to

improve on Orcagna's Christ in the "Last Judgment" at Pisa, wherein this truly great artist represents Christ as pointing to His wounded side with the left hand and to heaven with the curved right arm. Michelangelo entirely missed this; he thought Christ was holding His arms in a threatening attitude towards mankind assembled beneath His throne; at any rate, he thought this a rather good idea, and so he has represented a Jupiter Tonans, a vulgar Jesus raising His right hand *to strike* men and hurl the thunderbolts of His wrath, whilst He draws away the left across His body in an attitude of loathing, lest He should be contaminated by their touch. The beautiful draped figure of Orcagna, with the bleeding side exposed and the sweet face bowed in sorrow, not at all in anger, is replaced by a coarse, muscular, beardless Jupiter, with the conventional rag round his loins, all the other saints, martyrs and confessors and virgins clustering round in unabashed nudity. Our Lady alone in the original picture was thought Christian enough to wear the garb of modesty. We have been told too often that this is the world's greatest picture; it may be the greatest exhibition of skill and even of genius, but in its original form, before the figures were draped (if we may call them draped even now) by the artist known thenceforth as Il. Braghettone ("The Breechesmaker"), the picture was only possible in the days of rabid Humanism.

III.

THE FIGURES AND SYMBOLS OF JESUS.

It would be tedious to inquire at any length into the difference between a figure and a symbol. The conclusion come to by eminent archæologists is that a symbol is something that has foundation in Sacred Scripture, whilst a figure has not. Hence the lamb is a symbol, for St. John Baptist said: "'Behold the Lamb of God;" on the other hand, the fish and pelican are not, for in no place is Christ referred to by these names. However, the Cross is considered a symbol, not a figure, and on this account bears the circle around it called the aureole.

The earliest figurative representation of Christ is as a Christian Orpheus playing on His lyre, whilst all the beasts and birds, representing the gentiles, flock to hear Him. This is a truly touching image, and was especially valuable in the early ages when the story of Orpheus was well known and very often depicted. This figure was later on replaced by a far more touching representation, that of the Good Shepherd. Christ tells us: "I am the Good Shepherd: I give My life for My sheep." Again, in that exquisite parable of the lost sheep, He tells how the good shepherd leaves his flock

and never rests till he has found the poor wanderer. This is a subject very rarely represented nowadays. I think it is Hoffman that has attempted it, but he has had the stupidity to represent Christ stooping with His back towards us. Holman Hunt has a rather remarkable picture of Christ leading His flock: He holds the crook along His shoulders with His arms outstretched along it. The sinking sun in the background throws the shadow of a cross in front of the Good Shepherd. Yet apart from these isolated instances we have to go back to ancient art to find the subject properly and frequently treated. On countless monuments we find Christ bearing the lost lamb lovingly across His shoulders. Sometimes Christ is represented as very weary, resting on His staff, in the spirit of the beautiful words of the "Dies Iræ:"

Quærens me sedisti lassus.
[You sat down wearied with seeking me.]

No less tender is the symbolic Lamb of God. Beautiful as are the young of most animals, none is so meek as the lamb. We are told in the life of that tender saint, Alphonsus de Ligouri, that the aged man burst into tears when some one put a tiny lamb into his arms, so forcibly did it remind him of the One that when led to the slaughter opened not His mouth. This symbol is so common in Scripture and so often repeated in art that it would be an endless task to go into details. We commonly see the lamb represented with a wound in its left side, whilst with one of its feet it holds a pennant over its shoulder bearing the words, "Behold the Lamb of God." We see it recumbent in death on our vestments, generally lying on the "book of the seven seals" of the Apocalypse. It wears the nimbus, cruciferous to represent Christ; when not cruciferous, it represents some Apostle or other saint. In the words of the Apocalypse, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and divinity and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and benediction." So greatly did this pæan enter into the sacred ritual of the Catholic Church that the praises of the Lamb are sounded in the most solemn places: at the Agnus Dei in the Mass and at the Communion of the Faithful. In fact, in the early ages the reverence paid to the Lamb threatened to become excessive, so that under the Emperor Justinian II. the Council of Quini-Sextum decreed that in future Christ's own person must be employed in works of art, and not the lamb. Still, this decree was unheeded even in the Emperor's own country of Greece, much more so in the West, and the lamb still continued to be the most lovable symbol of Christ.

After seeing Christ so often represented as the gentlest of beasts, perhaps it will seem rather strange that the king of beasts should also symbolize Our Saviour. The lion is well known as the figurative representation of St. Mark, and we would be led to think that the lion could refer to no one else were it not true that the royal creature is often represented wearing a cruciferous nimbus, not a plain one, thereby showing that Christ is the person represented. The foundation in Scripture is the famous passage: "The Lion of the tribe of Judah has conquered."

We now come to the fish, which is a *figure* and not a *symbol* of Christ. How it came to be so is rather obscure. It is generally held that the Christians in the days of persecution invented this sign, as a password, for the letters of the Greek word for fish, Icthus, in order, represent the initial letters of the Greek words "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour." We cannot trace the origin of the emblem or say whether the words were formed from the Greek letters or vice versa. It was rarely used in Greece, and it is most surprising how a cold-blooded, undomesticated creature like the fish could ever hold its own so long against that dear creature the lamb, especially when God Himself chose the latter appellation for Christ. This figure gradually became more and more elaborated (if we may use such an expression in speaking of bad taste), until we find God represented as sitting holding a rod and line, which are composed of patriarchs and prophets, ending in a hook to which Christ crucified is affixed as bait. This is imagination gone mad, but it shows how these ideas are driven to death, the more so if they are at first of only limited value.

We must, however, bear in mind that not all figures of fish on Christian monuments apply to Christ. It was common in earlier ages, and is common still in Armenia, to represent a man's trade figuratively on his tombstone. Thus, a mason is represented by trowel and hammers, a vine dresser by a bunch of grapes, and so on. In like manner the fish must, in very many instances, refer to the avocation of the deceased—that of fishing.

Another figure of Christ is the pelican, the bird that was supposed to tear its own breast to feed its young. This legend arises from the redness of the bird's breast, just as we have a similar legendary origin of the redness of the robin, who, stories tell us (stories we would gladly believe), plucked a thorn from the bleeding head of Jesus. This figure of the pelican is so applicable to the Sacrament of the Altar that it has been entirely restricted thereto.

We find a real symbol in the vine, for Christ Himself says: "I am the vine; you are the branches." Now, this symbol would fail almost entirely as an emblem of Christ's person; it was surely

meant to refer to His Eucharistic body. We have grown too familiar with this usage of the vine to be able to imagine any other. Not only by spreading over a whole chapel wall does it represent the ubiquity of the Eucharistic Presence, but it more particularly depicts the very materials used in the Holy Sacrifice. Hence we find it nowadays used exclusively to symbolize the Real Presence.

IV.

THE CROSS AND THE CRUCIFIX.

These symbols of the Second Divine Person are so extensively used that they need separate treatment. The legendary history of the Cross is as quaint as that of the Holy Grail. When Adam died Seth took a shoot from the tree of knowledge and planted it; from this there sprang three little trees on one trunk. Aaron got his rod from this tree, whilst at a later date Solomon sought to employ the trunk of the tree as a column for his palace. It was found unsuitable and used as a bridge to cross a torrent. The Queen of Sheba refused to cross by this bridge, saying that one day this log would destroy the Jews. Solomon thereupon threw it into the Pool of Bethesda, to the waters of which it conveyed healing properties. It was on this wood that Christ was crucified; after His death it was buried on Golgotha, and three centuries later unearthed by St. Helena; after this it was captured and removed to Persia, and finally restored to Jerusalem by the Emperor Heraelius. The Christians divided it into small portions, and it is now an object of veneration in countless churches throughout Christendom. It is to reappear at the Last Judgment.

This quaint legend shows what reverence was paid by the early Christians to the interment of the Passion; in fact, they treated it as a person, and hence we find Christ represented solely by the Cross in pictures of the Holy Trinity. They saw the Cross in everything: in the points of the compass, the flight of a bird, the outstretched arms of a man, the yardarm of a ship. Countless churches were dedicated to the Holy Cross, beginning with the Santa Croce, Constantine's first church. Moreover, nearly every church has the Cross for its ground plan; in many the apse leans a little to the left as you look towards it, to represent the drooping of Christ's head on the Cross of Calvary.

It is well known that the Cross became a secret sign among the Christians in times of persecution. They employed it at all times. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says in his instructions to catachumens: "'Make that sign whenever you eat or drink, when you seat yourselves, when you lie down or rise up; in a word, let it

accompany every action of your life." In early times there was no special rule as to touching the left or right shoulder first; people were indifferent. We, of course, always touch the left before the right. It is a remarkable fact that Protestants not only do not employ the sign of the Cross, but consider it a Popish superstition, as ridiculous as genuflecting.

The Crucifix is perhaps the commonest object in all Christian iconography; we regret to say that devotion has not been the sole motive of the cult. Legend tells us that Christ was about to be crucified in all the shame of nakedness, just as when He was scourged, but that Our Lady petitioned the soldiers to fasten her veil about Him. However true this story may be, the fact remains that the early Christians never represented Christ naked on the Cross, but always draped in priestly vestments, often with a gold crown on His head. The earliest representation I know of is one that is still preserved in the ruins of St. Maria Antica in the Roman Forum. There Christ wears a Dalmatic. I would place this picture about the seventh century, though some go back as far as the sixth. The most curious and ancient of all Crucifixions, however, is a caricature that was discovered in the Pedagogium of the Flavian Palace in Rome. It is now in the Kircherian Museum at the Collegio Romano. A slave had scratched on the wall the image of a man with an ass's head nailed to a cross; below is written in Greek: "Alexamenos worships his God." Alexamenos was a Christian slave, and is shown in an attitude of prayer. This dates from the Greek period of Roman history—when Greek was the language of the upper classes, viz., second or third century.

Among draped figures of the Crucifix that of Burgos in Spain is a famous example. There the (solid) Crucifix wears a long apron of real cloth from the waist to the feet.

We are told that Giotto, the great leader of the revival of art in Italy, employed a man to hang on a cross whilst he painted a crucifixion. Not satisfied with his attempt at realism, he is said to have plunged a knife into the heart of his model, and thus obtained the real effect of Christ's death agony. On being arrested he daubed the picture over with some material and so effaced it. His judge, loath to lose the picture, said he would acquit Giotto if he would restore the painting or execute one as good. Thereupon Giotto took a sponge and washed away the substance he had smeared it with. No one is willing to believe such a story in connection with one of the greatest religious painters in history.

After Giotto's time appeared the practice of painting Christ almost entirely nude; we are so familiar with this manner of representation that we would consider it strange to see the figure

treated otherwise. It was about the same time that the Infant Christ was first represented naked or only partially clothed. There are two main reasons for the nudity of Christ in the Crucifix, the latter of which applies with equal force to the new way of representing the Child. We feel safe in saying that the undraped Crucifix is truer to history, but reverence prevented the early and mediæval artists from thus perpetuating the outrage on Christ's modesty; moreover, they felt that nothing could be gained by representing an almost nude figure that might conceivably scandalize the little ones of Christ. The outburst of Humanism at the Renaissance dissipated all qualms of this kind. Christianity must have nude figures no less than paganism; such was the view of the time. Ready to hand was Christ dying in shame on the Cross, and it was for this reason, to a more considerable extent than we perhaps realize, that Crucifixions are the commonest of all religious works. No better opportunity could be got or imagined for showing the anatomical skill of the artist, representing as he did Christ dying, Christ on His weeping Mother's knees (known as a *Pietà*), Christ being entombed. I would hesitate to make this charge against our greatest artists were it not supported beyond all chance of refutation by the extraordinary frequency of the martyrdom of St. Sebastian in art. No saint, after the Blessed Virgin, is perhaps so often treated as the youthful soldier; on no other have the greatest artists lavished so much skill. Why? Chiefly because St. Sebastian could be represented as a Christian Apollo, almost nude, with the arrows buried in his exquisite, gently contorted frame. Any one acquainted with the Philistinism of those Humanists who incurred the just anger of Savanarola will readily admit the truth of these imputations.

V.

THE HOLY GHOST.

The Third Divine Person need not detain us long; we have already made allusions to Him in the earlier section of this treatise. His personality has always been more difficult to our reason than that of Father and Son; it is hard for us to imagine how a third person could originate from the mutual love of the first and second persons. This is the chief mystery in the Trinity, and was the subject of savage heresy in the early Church.

However, we are not concerned with theology here, but with history, tradition and art. It may prove of interest to record how the Holy Ghost has fared in the hands of the artist. The chief form in which the Holy Ghost appears is in that of a dove, as this was the form assumed historically at Christ's baptism. This

figure was first used in the sixth century and was always the most popular, for the dove signifies love and rapidity of motion. About the tenth century the Third Person began to be represented as a man, with no historical support. In the sixteenth century the human image was entirely superseded by the original form, the dove, which holds the field at the present day.

The dove presents some difficulty, for the Deity must wear the cruciferous nimbus, and artists, especially sculptors, often found it next to impossible to insert such a nimbus on so small a head. Hence we cannot always be sure that our dove represents the Holy Ghost. The Divine Child is often seen holding a bird, sometimes a sparrow or a finch, and possibly where He holds a dove the bird is not necessarily symbolic. In the miraculous statue of Our Lady of Youghal, an early *cinquecento* piece, Our Lady holds a dove; it would be hard to say whether it signifies the Holy Ghost or is merely a symbol of purity.

The Third Person has to be represented as tongues of fire in pictures of the Pentecost. Some artists insert the dove and make the fire dart in the form of rays from the mouth of the bird.

We have thus attempted the art history of the three Persons separately. A still more mystical subject is that of the Three in One, the Trinity. An account of the treatment of this unapproachable mystery as one subject would require very many pages in itself. We prefer to halt here, dazed, as Dante was when his vision ended, by the unimaginable beauty and fascinating mystery of the Triune God.

Qual è 'l geometra che tutto s'affige
Per misurar lo cerchio, e non ritrova,
Pensando, quel principio ond 'egli indige;
Tale ero io a quella vista nuova:
Veder voleva, come si convenne
L'imago al cerchio, e come vi s'indova;
Ma non eran da ciò le proprie penne;
Se non che la mia mente fu percossa
Da un fulgore, in che sua voglia venne.
All 'alta fantasia qui mancò possa;
Ma già volgeva il mio desiro e il *velle*,
Si come rota ch 'equalmente è mossa,
L'amor che move il sole e l'altre stelle.*

Paradiso, Canto xxxiii., 133-145.

[Just as the geometrician who does all he can to measure the circle, and finds not, for all his thinking, the principle he lacks, such was I at this new sight: I wished to see how agreed the image with the circle, and how it settles there; but not for this were my own wings, save that my mind was stricken by a flash, wherein its will came to it. Here power failed before the high fantasy; but already my desire and will were rolled—just as a wheel that revolves evenly—by the love that moves the sun and other stars.]

C. Flynn.

Mount Melleray, Ireland.

LAST DAYS OF TALLEYRAND.

AMONG the many men of mark whom the dramatic events that made the closing years of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century momentous in modern history—events in which the elements of tragedy and comedy commingle—was Charles Maurice Talleyrand de Perigord, Prince of Benevento and Bishop of Autun. He was a typical man of his time and of his race. A statesman of the first rank, were it not for the unfortunate accident in his infancy which lamed him for life, he might have left behind him a more unsullied record. Deprived by a *conseil de famille,* on that account, of his rights of primogeniture, arbitrarily transferred to his younger brother, Comte d'Archambaud, the usual alternative of providing him with another career at the expense of the Church was resorted to and he was made an ecclesiastic, such as they too commonly made them in France in those days "when still the Bourbons held the throne," when Gallicanism was dominant and the French aristocracy looked upon the higher places in the Church as their particular appanage. An ecclesiastic *malgre lui,* its obligations rested very lightly upon him. It is sufficiently significant that it was in the circle of which the too famous Madame du Barry was the centre that his caustic wit and cleverness first brought him into notice at that corrupt and corrupting court which had such a baneful influence upon society, both clerical and lay. Aristocratic birth—his father belonged to a younger branch of the princely family of Chalais and his mother was also of noble lineage—allied to his own talents and scholarship paved the way to rapid promotion. Though his morals were of the epoch, they did not prevent Louis XV., in compliance with his father's dying request, securing for him the Bishopric of Autun. That was at the beginning of the memorable year 1789, when France was being led to that delirious Dance of Death, its great Revolution, which produced such a political vertigo that it does not seem even yet to have quite recovered its equilibrium. Talleyrand then began to fill that versatile rôle of a kind of political Vicar of Bray on a grand scale, in which he long played so many prominent parts on the stage of history, whoever ruled or misruled; a royalist under the Bourbons, a revolutionist under the Directory, a Bonapartist under the Consulate and the First Empire, royalist again under the Restoration, Bonapartist for the second time after Napoleon's escape from Elba, then Orleanist as often as fickle France changed its masters he changed his policy, trimming his sails whatever way the wind blew. Nevertheless, his genius for statecraft was such, such was

the force of his master mind, that he was practically regarded as indispensable in the conduct of most of those great affairs which influenced the course of European history in his time until, in 1834, he quitted public life forever.

The dramatic element runs through all his varied life from start to finish. As was said of Mirabeau, he dramatized his death, inas much as the last solemn scene in it, his reconciliation with the Church, became an event of public interest. And it was fitting that it should. As his daring attack on the rights and privileges of the ecclesiastical order at the beginning of the Revolution; his oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy—a bad example which, to their credit be it recorded, only two other Bishops followed; his consecration of innovating Bishops appointed by the Assembly, which had entailed his excommunication, and his sacrilegious marriage after that excommunication was raised by Pius VII., who dispersed him from exercising his ecclesiastical functions in order to administer civil affairs, but not from the sacerdotal vow of celibacy—as these acts were public scandals it was fitting that the reparation should also be public.

The instrument chosen by Providence to effect this conversion, to get the aged statesman, now bent with the weight of eighty-four years, to perform this grand act of reparation—the greatest act of his long life—to bring back this prodigal son to the father's house, was the Abbé Dupanloup. The future Bishop of Orleans was then a young, or comparatively young, priest, but one out of the common. He had already acquired such fame as a pulpit orator that six years after the inauguration of the Notre Dame Conferences he was called to fill the chair of sacred eloquence at the Sorbonne. His sermons at St. Sulpice, St. Roch—then the most fashionable church in the French metropolis—and Notre Dame were talked of all over Paris. He refused two of the principal parishes in Paris that he might become first prefect of studies and subsequently director of the Seminary of St. Nicholas-du-Chardonnet. His work in the confessional enlarged the reputation he gained in the pulpit. In the direction of conscience, as well as in the direction of studies, he exercised a salutary and profound influence over contemporary society, owned by all who heard, read or approached him. "In friendly or paternal counsel," wrote one who knew him intimately, "he had the penetrating unction, the exquisite gentleness of a Francis de Sales and the firmness, righteous severity and masculine language of a Bossuet. In religious intercourse no priest ever spoke with more charity, with more winning tenderness to men seeking the light and ready to detest their early faults. He loved and inspired the love of goodness; it was a mysterious interchange of

divine grace between the heart of the devoted priest and that of the penitent; in a word, he had the art of conquering souls to Jesus Christ."

It was this young priest of thirty-six, whose missionary work had hitherto been chiefly among the innocent children whom he catechised at the Madeleine or youth set apart for the service of the sanctuary, who, in May, 1838, was chosen by Monsignor de Quelen, Archbishop of Paris, to receive the deathbed confession of Talleyrand and his formal written retraction of the errors of a lifetime unusually prolonged. It was the dying injunction of Cardinal de Perigord, Monsignor de Quelen's predecessor, to his coadjutor and successor, to use every endeavor to bring about the conversion of his too famous nephew; and faithfully and zealously did Monsignor de Quelen fulfill the solemn trust. "Take my life, oh, my God, but grant me his soul!" was his frequent and fervent prayer. "I know," said the old diplomatist, smiling, "that the Archbishop wants to gain my soul to present it to the Cardinal." If, in Shakespearean phrase, "nothing in his life became him like the leaving of it," it was the Abbé Dupanloup who helped him to make this happy exit after he had played his part in life's drama and death let fall the curtain upon the last act.

In response to the request of a friend in Italy, he gave me a letter from Paris, dated February 2, 1839, an exact and authentic narrative of the last days and death of Talleyrand. "God," he wrote, "Who made me witness of so great a mercy, did not give me such a consolation for myself alone; this consolation belongs to the whole Church, for a great reparation has been made to its honor, and a Saul, whose long and sad alienation religion has for fifty years bewailed, has at last been restored to the truth, to the light of faith and to the holy joys of Christian hope; it is at least my deep and inmost conviction."

He goes on to relate how the first summons to the Hotel Talleyrand was an invitation to dinner in February, 1838—one would think a rather commonplace commencement to an intercourse which was to have such an important result. He confesses that he was singularly surprised and embarrassed by it. He was aware that he had been spoken of to the aged statesman by the latter's niece, Pauline de Perigord, who had been under his spiritual direction since her first Communion; but it seemed to him extraordinary and almost significant that he should have been invited to a family gathering on Talleyrand's birthday. He was then about entering on his eighty-fifth year, having been born on February 2, 1754. It was evidently not a simple, ordinary invitation to dinner, and after some reflection and with the approval of the Archbishop, he declined,

alleging his functions and retired life as an excuse for not availing of the honor. Talleyrand was put out and said with a serious air, "That refusal surprises me; they told me the Abbé Dupanloup was a man of parts. If that was true, he would have come, he would have realized the importance of his entering this house." These words, which showed that there was something in the background of his thoughts, when repeated to Dupanloup, awakened regret, and when the invitation was renewed for Sunday, February 18, it was accepted. He went, not without some misgivings and not overpleased to leave his pious retreat for the Rue Saint-Florentine, realizing the importance, but fearing the inutility of the step, knowing well that the next day all Paris and its gossiping papers would get hold of the news, which actually occurred. Like everybody else, he was very distrustful of Prince Talleyrand's good faith, knowing how clever and wily he was, and, though the exercise of his ministry and a conscientious sense of duty impelled him, he was decided beforehand to act straightforwardly and not suffer himself to be led into playing such a dubious part.

"I crossed the threshold of M. de Talleyrand's hotel in these dispositions," says Dupanloup, "trusting in God, Who knew my uprightness and praying Him to make me avoid extreme severity, which would be unbecoming and culpable in view of good faith and a sincere reconciliation; but asking Him also to spare my ministry the misfortune of the slightest weakness. I entered at last. The Prince received me with the greatest graciousness. He was seated in one of those big armchairs, large and lofty, in which he habitually sat, and from which, with his elevated glances and his brief, occasional, well delivered, sparkling speech, he dominated all around him. I do not know if Kings are more kingly in their palaces than M. de Talleyrand seemed in his salon. It was this celebrated salon the Emperor Alexander occupied, where so many passions were stirred, so many affairs discussed, so many interests decided—the fate of France and of Europe. I found more people in this salon than I expected; however, I reached him. After the exchange of the first expressions of my respect and his good will, they brought me and he himself offered me a chair near him." They entered into conversation, which, for the first half hour, was rather reserved on his side, while Dupanloup felt interiorly a sentiment of deep compassion and sadness at the sight of this old man. The conversation was more animated during dinner and, to his surprise, took a religious, almost an ecclesiastical, turn. Talleyrand talked of sermons and preachers, quoting several fine passages from discourses he had heard in his youth; of the Archbishop of Paris and of the works of charity to which he devoted his life and what little for-

tune remained to him, ending with a denunciation of the nineteenth century as an epoch of contempt for all authority, inveighing against those madmen who attack the religious idea, and adding, "What a sad time is ours when nothing is any longer respected!" When the twenty diners adjourned to the dining-room, which Talleyrand entered last, leaning on the arm of his young niece or one of his grandnephews, they talked of nothing but St. Sulpice, of the seminary, of old Sulpicians wio had been his teachers, of the greatest theologians of that society and time, notably M. Emery, whose lofty virtue and admirable conduct under difficult circumstances he warmly praised. The words of Fenelon to Louis XIV., "I know nothing more apostolic, more venerable than Saint-Sulpice," were often recalled, as well as memories of the Church of France and its days of trial, ever its most glorious, which naturally led Talleyrand to utter a magnificent and touching éloge of the venerable Pontiff, Pius VII. "I declare," says Dupanloup, "I was much struck astonished, almost carried away; I could not refrain from saying to myself as I left there certainly was one of the most edifying conversations held in Paris to-day; it really only wanted a cross on that breast to persuade me that I was conversing with one of the most venerable Bishops in France. I left the Hotel Talleyrand struck by the somewhat solemn state of its master; despite myself there rose before me that noble and lofty head, those expressive and imposing features, that penetrating and profound gaze; I thought, above all, of the respect, the care, the affection, I would almost say the cult of his family and friends, behind which the private man seemed to repose from the world's agitations, considering from thence, in perfect tranquillity, the extraordinary violence of the outrages and insults poured on the public man. For one thing of which I was not aware, and which is generally ignored, is that Prince de Talleyrand was venerated and beloved by all who approached him, and, as this veneration and affection lasted during a whole life of almost a century, those who have spoken so ill and never well of him, I said to myself, must have been rather wrong and not have known all. But the liveliest recollection I retained of my first interview with Prince de Talleyrand was that character of gravity, that kind of religious preoccupation which at first impressed me in his conversation. There was not perhaps an expression which a Bishop might not have used; the rectitude and orthodoxy of the principles, the nobility and purity of the sentiments bore witness to sincere and profound reflections and a most pronounced interest in ideas of that kind. It seemed to me very difficult that a man who knew how to make such reflections and openly pay homage to such principles should escape the necessity of reflecting on himself and perhaps

severely condemning himself; at least there was evidently therein a working of conscience and grace."

About this time occurred a remarkable incident which shed further light on the religious bent of his mind. On March 3, 1838, he delivered at the institute, or, to give it its full title, l'Academie des Sciences, Morales et Politiques, his discourse on the occasion of the death of Reinhard, his confrère and friend. It was in some sort his own apologia and was chiefly concerned with theology. In fine phrases, constructed with all the skill of a literary artist, in presence of a numerous concourse whose curiosity was aroused by the man and the matter, he praised in Reinhard the theologian and the diplomatist, two characters in which the orator assembled his subject, of whom, as Dupanloup puts it, he availed as a text to solemnly pay a last and public homage to the religious studies of his own youth and explain the lofty, though often misunderstood, principles of diplomacy in the sphere of *la haute politique*. One of the principal points in Reinhard which he especially emphasized was the sentiment of duty, which he went so far as to call "the religion of duty," thus half revealing what was then passing in his own mind. The discourse, which exhibited Talleyrand in a new character, created universal surprise. The day before its delivery, as he was going through the manuscript, he stopped at the words "the religion of duty" and said smilingly, "There's something that will please the Abbé Dupanloup." When he reached the passage on theological studies some one ventured to interrupt him and interject the remark, "Admit that this is much more applicable to you than to this good M. Reinhard." "But surely," he observed, "there is no harm in bringing the public back to my point of departure?" And when it was shown to him what a consolation it was to see him place the close of his life under the shadow of the memories and good traditions of his early youth, "I was sure that would please you," he replied.

When Dupanloup, after receiving a copy of his discourse, called to thank him in person and Mdlle. de Perigord discreetly left them alone together, Talleyrand's first words, after a moment's silence, were: "Well! Monsieur l'abbé, I spoke of duty in my discourse at the Academy. I wished to do so on that occasion." Dupanloup conveyed the consolation, he did not venture yet to express the hopes, which those grave words had given to the Archbishop and himself. The conversation, as it proceeded, turned on theology, which he had designedly eulogized, reverting to the old Church of France and then to the Sulpicians, ever present to his mind. The Abbé Dupanloup showed how moved he was by his affection for his old masters, so faithfully preserved. They conversed in the

same grave strain for half an hour, the conversation assuming a melancholy tingue when he spoke of his health and his great age and the reflections which old age brings. "I am very old, Monsieur l'abbê," he said; "I am very old! This season is very bad. I am getting ill! Yes, that's bad!" he added with an uneasy and painful movement. "The sad words he addressed to me," says Dupanloup, "seemed to reveal to me the secret of his gravest thoughts and indicate that his inmost reflections were from that time directed towards a serious future; I could not doubt it. These words appeared even to invite me to take a step forward, for they were followed by a moment of deep silence, during which I observed with extreme compassion his sad, downcast look and the painful agitation of his mind. It assuredly cost him a great effort to utter those words, and yet I hesitated for some time replying; a sense of reserve and indefinable delicacy, for which I now praise myself, and which seemed to me a duty, restrained my zeal. All at once he abruptly broke this too long silence with: 'How did you find Mdme. de Dino, monsieur l'abbé?' 'Suffering much, Prince, but more concerned about you than about himself.' 'It is true,' said he. This expression encouraged me and I added, 'I found Mdme. de Dino and her daughter very deeply, very seriously concerned about you.' He looked at me with a grateful and tender expression without uttering a word. At that moment I rose to take my leave. That day and the following days M. de Talleyrand appeared greatly preoccupied and much more serious than usual. It was at this epoch he went to his notary to revise his will, in which he had made an important change, of which I was later informed, and which if I had known it then would have cleared many doubts, removed many anxieties. But after making this change M. de Talleyrand closed his will, sealed it and showed absolute silence on the change he had made therein. What is very remarkable and what we only knew still later was that eighteen months before that he had already asked for his will and added to it with his own hand, under date October, 1836, express words in which he declared that he wished to die in the bosom of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church.

"Some days after my last visit it occurred to me to make him a present of Fenelon's 'Christianity Presented to Men of the World.' It seemed to me that it could be a return present for what he had made me of his discourse at the Academy, and would be even a means of respectfully continuing relations which I conscientiously felt I should no longer interrupt. Still, before sending him this work, I had to make sure I was not committing an indiscretion, and the Duchess de Dino, whom I consulted, replied through Mdlle. de Perigord, her daughter, that M. de Talleyrand would receive the

book and author with great pleasure. Upon this response I no longer hesitated and sent the book, accompanied by the following letter, which you will perhaps consider very daring; but it seemed to me that I could, that I ought to speak this language. It at last became necessary to impart something significant to my relations, and the occasion appeared to me suitable; I did it, and God blessed my boldness. Here is this letter:

" 'Prince, Mdlle. Pauline assures me that I would not be too indiscreet if I take the liberty of offering you as a present a very simple and very unpretentious work, but to which the name of Fenelon has given some value and perhaps useful success; and the extreme kindness you have for some time shown me likewise encourages me to commit this indiscretion.

" 'It is very true that some few and not too numerous pages of mine are in these six volumes, but this is not on my account. I would venture to present it to you in exchange for the discourse delivered at the Academy, of which you were pleased to send me a copy; it is through Fenelon I am endeavoring to discharge my debt of gratitude and to make you share the delightful pleasure I experienced in reading these few pages, of which it is not permissible to me to speak here except with respectful reserve; it is therefore by favor and, as it were, under the shelter of such a good name I venture to submit myself to your kind indulgence.

" 'What increases my confidence, Prince, is that the genius, virtues and sacred character of the Archbishop of Cambria, and above all his misfortunes and his admirable return impart to his life something incomparable and complete to his language irresistible force and sweetness, to his memory something inexpressibly venerable and moving. Shall I venture to say to you in all simplicity? Fenelon was, like you, a student of Saint-Sulpice; all his life he cherished recollections of it, and when dying wrote to Louis XIV., "I know nothing more apostolic and more venerable than Saint-Sulpice." When, then, I found reappear in your discourse Fenelon's profound and living gratitude to those who had had the forming of his clerical youth; when I heard you, like him, rejoice in memories of Saint-Sulpice and cordially eulogize the venerable teachers of your early years; when, amid all the remembrances of a life so checkered, the grand days of the old Church of France, which you have seen in its brilliancy and its decline, are to you the deepest, dearest and most familiar memoirs, I, an unknown child of Saint-Sulpice and an obscure admirer of Fenelon, felt moved and was confident that a book protected by such a great name would be well received by you.

" 'It will perhaps also be presented by the hands of that child, a

true angel of grace and piety, whose solicitude, affection and innocence environ your old age; her noble simplicity and angelic candor will remind you of the pious and agust old men whose name and virtues are to you so precious an inheritance; a holy and truly apostolic man who blessed us all with such sweet majesty, whom the Church of Paris has seen growing old in a long and laborious career of duty, whom it has seen die the death of the just, and whose memory will forever be held in benediction.

"'Monday, 26th March, 1838.'"

The self-evident object of this letter, as he points out, was to ask Talleyrand, in the name of Fenelon, who set him such a grand example; in the name of the Sulpicians, whom he loved, and of the Church of France, he had so unhappily scandalized, and, finally, in the name of his young niece and the pious Cardinal de Perigord, to rejoice that Church and his family and honor his memory by his return and reconciliation. He was doubtful if it would attain its object; he was afraid it might displease him, and was in a state of extreme uncertainty until, the next morning, he received the following hastily written but expressive lines: "I don't like to lose a minute in telling you, monsieur l'abbé, that your admirable letter has led up to this great and unexpected conversation. . . . I hope for good results from it and I will gladden your kind heart. I am still so moved and so done up that my hand trembles."

Pauline de Perigord gave the present and letter herself to Talleyrand and then retired. He remained alone and read it. Some hours afterwards the Duchess de Dino found him still alone and very serious. "I have received a letter from the Abbé Dupanloup," he said after a few moments' silence. "Are you aware of it?" "No, sir." "Well, read it." She took the letter from his hand and began to read it herself. "No, read it out loud." This recommendation was significant and foreshadowed some result. She read it. He listened patiently, apparently unmoved, although towards the end Mdme. de Dino found it difficult to suppress her emotion. "Finish it," he said somewhat bluntly; "it is not an occasion for being emotional. All that is serious." Then, when she had concluded, after a few moments of silent reflection, he said abruptly: "If I became seriously ill I would ask for a priest. Do you think the Abbé Dupanloup would like to come?" "I don't doubt it," replied the Duchess de Dino; "but in order that he might be of service to you it would be necessary that you should have returned to the position which you unhappily left." "Yes, yes," he continued; "I have something to do with Rome, I know; I have even thought of it for

* After Talleyrand's death it was found among his papers, with a note in his handwriting indicating the reply.

a long time." "Since when?" queried Mdme. de Dino, much surprised at this unexpected revelation. "Since the last visit of the Archbishop of Bourges at Valencay, and again subsequently when the Abbé Taury came there. I asked myself then why the Archbishop, who was more directly my pastor, did not prompt me, why this good Sulpician said nothing." The Duchess, clasping his hands and placing herself in front of him, said, with tears in her eyes: "But why wait to be prompted? Why not spontaneously, freely, generously take this step, most honorable to yourself, most consoling to the Church and right-minded people? You would find Rome well disposed, I know. The Archbishop of Paris is very much attached to you. Try." "I don't refuse," he replied. "I have something to do I know well. But do you know what they want from me? Why don't they tell me?" "Well, sir, do you wish me to tell you? I shall do so if you wish," pursued the Duchess. "Say it; I shall be very glad." "Shall I close your door so that you may not be disturbed?" "Yes, close it." She closed the door and, alone with Talleyrand, went thoroughly into the question which the Archbishop had explained to her in great detail, courageously broaching the most painful and most delicate part of it, telling Talleyrand straight out what the Church demanded of him and the reparation he owed it on account of his oath to the Civil Constitution of the clergy, the consecration of Bishop Gobel and the scandal of his marriage. "But I was free," he remarked as to the last named point. "The Brief of Pius VII. had released me from my priestly and episcopal vows." She explained to him that it was quite otherwise. He listened with a gravity and a mildness which raised high hopes and closed the conversation with these decisive words: "I have had those thoughts a long time in my mind, but as I have something more to do, I must not delay; I don't wish that they should ever attribute to senile weakness what I shall do; I ought to do it in the very month of my Academy address."

Some days afterwards Dupanloup received from Talleyrand a letter, in which he said: "All the memories you invoke, monsieur l'abbê, are indeed very dear to me, and I thank you for having guessed the place they have preserved in my mind and in my heart." This was followed by a present of a rare old Elzevir edition of the *Imitation,* accompanied with the remark that he would be happy to hear that he had made it, in preference to any other, his *vade mecum.*

Dupanloup paid him a third visit after Easter, when the conversation was resumed in the same strain, as if there had been no interruption. They talked of the Holy Week ceremonies, of the crowds frequenting the churches, of the Lenten sermons and of the religious

movement which singularly interested and gratified him. His visitor, when leaving, left on the table Bossuet's *Journêe du Chretien*. Knowing that he was actively engaged in bringing to a conclusion the serious work begun, Dupanloup deemed it his duty to be more reserved according as he became more favorably disposed, and learned afterwards that Talleyrand was pleased at his discretion.

Some weeks afterwards he paid him a visit of condolence in the death of his brother, the Duc de Talleyrand, who for several years had been paralyzed. In the course of a conversation, which Dupanloup describes as the most curious of any he had with him, he spoke of the death of his mother, which took place twenty-nine years previously (June, 1809), with an expression of affection and regret that proved to his visitor what he was beginning to suspect—that he had a depth of feeling, a heart as generally as it was unjustly misunderstood. He was particularly struck by the tranquil and religious composure with which he talked for half an hour of death and the necessity of preparing for it. Far from these grave and gloomy thoughts agitating him, he seemed to take pleasure in them. He recalled, evidently on purpose, an incident that occurred in the Chamber of Deputies, where, speaking of the death of his brother, who for forty years had been deprived of the use of his faculties and died without recovering consciousness, Royer-Collard dissented from a deputy who had expressed a wish to die suddenly—*foudroyé*—saying that the thought of death was in his mind every day. When he came to the word *foudroyé* he suddenly paused and added in a low but distinct voice, "Mourir d'un coup de foudre! c'est trop fort!" And the expression of his face, comments Dupanloup, completed his thought. As the conversation became still graver and more religious, the abbé, pursuing his advantage, said: "Certainly after a long life mixed up with so many agitations it is supremely rational to wish for at least some peaceful moments to realize and recover oneself before dying." "Evidently, monsieur l'abbé," he replied. Although it was a long conversation, Talleyrand wished to detain him as he was taking his departure and asked him not to leave so soon.

They never met without his referring in the most affectionate terms to the Archbishop of Paris, his health and his work and his wandering life, dwelling in a grieved tone on the strange abandonment in which His Grace was left, it being debated whether he was to be located in the Hotel de Ville, Talleyrand observing that if he were in his place, he would prefer to live with one of his canons in the Rue Bossuet, quite near the old Archbishop's house—an idea which Dupanloup approved as "a truly episcopal idea." This flat-

tered the ex-Bishop of Autun, who became more animated. "Yes," he proceeded, "that would have been very good, admirable, a grand and happy effect! The Archbishop of Paris, poor and wandering, is a very dignified figure, but lodged in that humble house his dignity would be extreme and embarrassing. There was no way of resisting him. You know, monsieur l'abbé, the beautiful expression that recalls to my mind, 'It is a wooden cross that saved the world.' Poverty well becomes those who know how to worthily bear its burthen." He paused, whereupon Dupanloup asked him if Montlosier had really used those words. "Yes, certainly," he replied; "I was there; the impression was extraordinary. We were twelve hundred, the tribunes were full. When the speaker uttered those words there was no applause, but all breathing was suspended and a few moments after he finished every one was heard to breathe again."

In these conversations, in which the question of life and death, of the principles and inmost sentiments of Talleyrand were introduced under disguised names, and as it were by a mutually tacit understanding, Dupanloup felt that great progress had been made towards the desired end. What was passing in the statesman's mind, up till then reserved, was suddenly revealed in a very important document, the first external act, the first explicit manifestation of the dispositions, regrets and repentance of Talleyrand. It was an appreciation, in some sort official, of the various circumstances of his long career, made by himself and consequently still incomplete, but nevertheless the serious beginning of the investigation in which he wished to definitely judge and condemn his life. This very long detailed document, which he of his own accord drew up fifteen days before his death, at a time when he was perfectly well, was sent directly to the Archbishop of Paris, who examined it very attentively and thought it very remarkable in many respects. It was an epitome of his lift in its two great political and religious phases, disclosing the errors into which the spirit of the age and human weakness had drawn him. It contained things relating to his religious divergencies which Dupanloup calls "very remarkable, very consoling," and which formed the basis of the declaration Talleyrand addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff. What the future Bishop of Orleans regarded as singularly remarkable was the language employed in referring to Protestantism, "that enemy of unity," as Talleyrand calls it, thus designating what constitutes the proper and distinctive character and at the same time the mark of reprobation and the incurable malady of Protestantism. But what is still worthier of observation is the tribute he pays to the venerable Pius VII.; the simplicity with which he always declares himself a "child of the Church;" his readiness to condemn anew the constitutional

schism, "if the Church deems it necessary," and the solemn words with which he concludes this declaration: "My last prayers will be for the Church and its Supreme Pastor." Then follow some lines full of good will and affection for the Archbishop: "If he should be pleased to lay before His Holiness the preceding brief explanations and the concluding declaration, it will have afforded me a new proof of that kindness which distinguishes him and which makes me most sincerely attached to him."

"Perhaps you will now ask me," writes Dupanloup to his correspondent in Rome, "why this document was not sufficient and why it was not sent to Rome at once. It is because, despite the excellent things it contained and which had the merit of being perfectly spontaneous, this document seemed still too incomplete and really insufficient. I told you M. de Talleyrand sought to excuse myself. That is conceivable; but that little fitting the great gravity of such a declaration. It contained, however, a suitable excuse, expressed with great delicacy and which has been embodied in his letter to the Pope; it is this: "The respect due to the memory of those to whom I owe my birth does not hinder me from saying that my whole youth has been led towards a profession for which I was not born." It is certainly impossible to express with more scrupulous respect what was fundamentally true, and which was to him the greatest of misfortunes. But he was rightly deemed not sufficiently explicit as to the imperceptible obligations of the sacerdotal character with which he had been invested. 'Released by the venerable Pius VII.,' he says. These words were not enough; M. de Talleyrand had been released from the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, but not released from his vows; he had ceased to be one of the active ministers of the Church, but he had not ceased to possess its ineffaceable character. Those were very important things, not stated with sufficient clearness, and which it was necessary to declare in order to atone in the presence of the Church or the scandal of a sacrilegious marriage. It should be noted, however, that M. de Talleyrand had previously explained himself in a way that left little to be desired. In that very will he had reopened to declare his wish to die in the bosom of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church was read this phrase: 'Released by the venerable Pius VII., I was free." *I was free* was an error; he recognized it, and, erasing the words, had replaced them by these: 'I believed I was free' (*Je me croyais libre*). This rectification was clear and satisfactory. But in an official declaration, which M. de Talleyrand wishes to lay before the head of the Church, this clear and satisfactory meaning ought above all to find a place; obscurity on that point, joined to the absence of ecclesiastical formalities, necessary in a document

of that importance and solemnity, obliged us to demand from him a new declaration in which the grave errors of his life were more formally condemned, and which would be a reparation as honorable to himself as consoling to the Church."

About ten days after this declaration was sent to the Archbishop of Paris he was stricken with his death illness. On Saturday, May 12, he was seized with a fit of shivering, followed by high fever. On Sunday, although the fever continued, he would not remain in bed, but passed the whole day in his room and salon and continually received people. On Monday the malady became more serious; an inflammatory and gangrenous tumor made its presence felt and called for an operation, to which he very courageously submitted; while it lasted the only words he uttered were: "Do you know you are making me very ill?" He possessed sufficient self-mastery and strength to reappear in his salon and receive as usual.

"I was not slow to be informed of all that was occurring," writes Dupanloup. "It had been several days since I had seen M. de Talleyrand, but, as you may well think, I had not ceased to think and pray much for him. The Archbishop had sent me the draft of the declaration of which I told you, directing me to return it to the Prince with essential modifications. I reproached myself for not being more prompt; true, I was far from foreseeing an ending so near; but what anxieties would have been spared us if I had finished dealing with this great affair while he was in the enjoyment of perfect health! This document, thus rectified, was couched, moreover, in the very words of the declaration written by the hand of M. de Talleyrand in two quarto pages. My mission was to obtain his signature to it and then complete his peace with God and his conscience. Such was the state of affairs when they came for me on the morning of Tuesday, the 15th. I arrived in the Rue Saint-Florentine. They at once gathered round me. 'He is very ill,' they said, 'very ill. However, he will see you willingly; as soon as Pauline mentioned your name he replied that he would receive you with pleasure and at once.'

"I made a strong effort to throw off those impressions of grief and weakness and entered the Prince's room. As soon as I appeared he said, 'We haven't met this long time, monsieur l'abbé; here I am very ill.' I delayed no longer and, in response to those sad words, with too great earnestness and preciseness perhaps, entered into the thoughts which this serious malady seemed to inspire him. I added that I brought him the two pages he had sent to the Archbishop, and that, if he pleased, I was going to read them to him such as they had been modified on some points. He replied with a firmness which I confess surprised and almost discouraged me: 'Mon-

sieur l'abbé, I had thought out well what I wrote. I have put everything in those two pages, and those who can read them will find therein all that is necessary.' This reply strangely embarrassed me. The situation was critical. I was on the point of rising and taking my leave, tendering him my wishes and regrets, when God assisted me; it quickly came into my mind, for I answered immediately: 'True, Prince, I recognized it; those who can read will find there what is necessary; but you are not unaware that in this country there are many people who do not know how to read. Permit me to add people will, besides, be very exacting in your regard; they won't care to read; they'll not find what is necessary in those two pages; they won't trouble to understand what you have put into them.' This observation struck him, and he at once replied, 'You are right.' I continued: 'The two pages I bring you are substantially and even often in the form and terms what you have written; there are in addition only some modifications which render them unassailable, and, if you allow me to add, more honorable to you, more consoling to your family, more satisfactory to the Church. Shall I read them?' 'Willingly,' he responded, 'but rather give them to me; I'll read them myself.' He took them from my hand and immediately began to read them. This reading took long. There is no reason for imagining M. de Talleyrand, notwithstanding his position and a condition that should deprive him of the power of concentration. A kind of paralysis took possession of his limbs and the lower part of his body; but he had the free and perfect use of the rest, particularly of his head, and everybody knows that without the least feebleness he preserved his composure of mind and freedom of spirit up to the last moment f his life. Seated, resting and almost erect on the edge of his bed, he kept that attitude up to his death; it was even thus he died, for he hardly lay down in his illness. It was in this position he read the draft of the declaration made by himself and revised by the Archbishop. I must say that at that moment his attitude was really imposing; his face calm, grave, meditative; his hand supported his brow; his eye was fixed and pensive, and I, motionless and silent, observed his impassive visage as he read with concentrated attention. Meanwhile I was hoping, praying interiorly. My anxiety was intense; I never realized so much man's impotence and the need of God's power and goodness to act on souls.

"The reading ended. After a moment's silence M. de Talleyrand, raising his hand, said: 'Monsieur l'abbé, I am very satisfied with this paper.' These words filled me with joy; I thought for a moment everything was done; I was going to ask him to finish this grand act on the spot by signing this declaration, when he

gave a new and unexpected proof of that independence which was the basis of his character and spirit, adding with extreme simplicity in a calm but resolute tone, 'Will you kindly leave me this paper? I wish to supervise it once more.' I was put out by this request. I had, nevertheless, to consent. I confess, besides, that M. de Talleyrand did not seem to me so ill as they said at first. He folded the paper himself and put it in his breast. Then he raised his eyes as if to speak to me. I anticipated it by a rapid and involuntary movement, asking him how he felt just then; if I had not importuned and wearied him? 'No, no,' he quickly replied; 'it has been a very great pleasure for me to see you.' Nevertheless, I wished to withdraw, but he retained me. I remained, then, alone with him and we conversed for rather a long time very seriously about his condition, of the future, of his death, perhaps near, and of God, Who alone could save him. This conversation was no longer of a nature to be related to you, even confidentially. God alone knows the secrets of His mercy and the ways of His grace in that soul. I at last retired, continuing to think that his condition, though serious, was certainly not extreme.

"Very early the next day they sent for me hurriedly. The invalid was much worse.

"You know, there was there a young and pious child, whose faith fully comprehended and shared our desires and solicitude. 'My daughter,' said her mother to her, 'you are aware all that you owe to your uncle's affection; now is the time to show him your gratitude!' And, continuing, she tearfully added that it now behooved her above all to discharge her heart's indebtedness by an immense and last service; that she should apprise him of my visit, remind him of his object and ask him not to refuse the consolations I was bringing him. The young lady, deeply moved, was melted to tears all the time her mother was speaking to her, and then all at once strength from God descended into her soul, her tears ceased, she wiped her eyes, raised her head and, after rapidly glancing at her mother and me, precipitately threw herself at my knees. 'Father,' she exclaimed in a voice of emotion, but full of confidence, 'give me your blessing!' My soul, I confess, could not endure the sight. I became in turn weaker than the child herself; tears flowed involuntarily from my eyes; then, extending my hand, I blessed the old man's visible angel in God's name. The young girl at once rose and, without turning her head, with a firm step and a resolute air which fixed our gaze upon all her movements, she withdrew, proceeded towards the invalid's room and disappeared. God knows the charm and force He gave to her words, but when she returned after the lapse of some time, she said to me with a smile mingled

with tears: 'Monsieur l'abbé, good uncle will be very happy to receive you.'

"I then entered and approached his bed. I found him peaceful. His eyes were lowered; he raised them, and a smile, touchingly kind, shed over his suffering face a gleam of satisfaction and serenity. His features, however, were visibly altered and disclosed the after effects of a painful attack; for this weakness, which had caused so many tears, was due to the acute suffering he felt in the diseased part of his body. The parlysis was making its way to the intestines; it was death which was mounting by degrees. Nevertheless, his aspect soothed my first fears. I found him ill, very ill, but not expiring; far from that, there was, as far as I could see, the sad chance that he might suffer long enough still before dying. the sad chance that he might suffer long enough still before dying.

"I spoke to him in a tone of deep compassion of his sufferings; he seemed to feel it very much. I talked to him of death; he listened gratefully. 'Prince,' I said to him, 'I bless God that I find you a little more peaceful this morning; but we have all prayed very earnestly for you, and if death, which threatens you,' I added with an emotion and tears I could not restrain, 'fills us all with sorrow, at least we thank God, Who will make it easier for you after you have used your time and strength to set in order the affairs of your conscience and your eternal salvation.' At these words M. de Talleyrand raised his head; the dejection in his features gave place to a more composed countenance; his face, his look resumed all their animation; his attention, his interest were aroused. The persons who, along with me, surrounded his bed withdrew and left us alone. 'Thank you,' he said to me with an expression of good will I cannot describe. Those words opened up the most serious conversation I yet had with him, for M. de Talleyrand was in full possession of all his faculties and I of a sort of zealous intrepidity which God lent me in such a grave moment. I then spoke to him in the strongest and most energetic language of his soul, of death, of eternity; I did not hide from him that he was nearing the end of his long and stormy career; that life for him was becoming extinct, and that he might at any moment appear before the tribune of God. I strongly depicted how dread were God's judgments. I was carried away by a poignant and irresistible emotion; I told him that it was timely and wise to forestall that terrible judgment by judging himself. Above all, I reminded him then that if he had admired that *wooden cross that saved the world,* it was also that very cross which was to bless his last moments, save his soul, purify his life, prepare his eternity, reunite him to his venerable uncle, the Cardinal; fulfill the wishes of the Archbishop, of his family and of

his best friends, and obtain for religion that just and indispensable satisfaction he had promised it and which, by my mouth, it conjured him to no longer defer giving it.

"These words were earnest, pressing; in uttering them my voice was animated; I was no longer master of my zeal; I was urged by the need of snatching that soul from a dreadful death, a danger worse than death, the peril of dying in a repentance begun, but not perfected. My conscience had reproached me with any weakness as a crime, and I must say I would have betrayed the very desires of the dying man who heard me. For I never shall forget the really full expression of gratitude which depicted itself in his face, the blessed avidity of his look as he listened to me. 'Yes, yes, I wish all that,' he said, offering me his hand and seizing mine with the most sensible emotion. 'I wish it; you know it. I have already told you so; I have said so to Mdme. de Dino.' And, continuing the private conversation of the previous day, doing complete justice to his whole life, he would have immediately begun the work of his reconciliation with God if I had not drawn his attention to the fact that his confession could not be finished until after his declaration—the indispensable preliminary to his reconciliation with God in presence of the Church. 'It is just,' he replied; 'then I wish to see Mdme. de Dino; I wish to reperuse those two documents along with her; I wish to add something, and then we shall finish.' There was strength in his voice when he spoke to me thus, and this thought somewhat consoled me for this new delay, to which I hoped, moreover, for a nearing conclusion.

"Towards the middle of the day he seemed at ease. Since our conversation in the morning I had seen him several times, and as I was afraid of fatiguing him, I said little to him, contenting myself with praying by his side, reciting my Breviary or my beads and asking him at intervals if he had any relief from his pains. 'You are doing me good,' he often repeated. 'You are doing me good!' He even added once, 'I would have already done what I promised you if I was not suffering so much.'

"I got the Duchess de Dino, however, to confer with him about the affairs of his retraction concerning which he had told me he wished to have a last talk with her. No need telling you with what heart throbbing I awaited the result of this conversation. What painful anxiety there was in all that weeping, praying family, among all those honest and true friends who crowded round his door! Everybody seemed to be waiting in suspense a sentence of life or death. M. Royer-Collard, who was there, uttered then a remarkable expression which had a great effect: 'Don't be afraid; he who has always been a man of peace will not refuse to make his peace

with God before dying.' This was told to M. de Talleyrand; his face at once became extraordinarily animated and he quickly raised himself, saying, 'I don't refuse, I don't refuse!'

"In fact, he had declared to the Duchess de Dino that he accepted all the terms of the declaration; that he recognized them as his own; that he wished to sign them and die a true and faithful child of the Catholic Church. 'You know, Mdme. Dino, I told you so long ago; I wish it.'

"It was impossible to use language more explicit, to show a firmer will; but it remained to give the last proof. They proposed to him to sign on the spot those two important documents. "I shall not delay,' he said, 'only I wish to look over them again. I have to add something and I am at this moment too fatigued; I'll tell you when it will be time.' 'But, Prince, while your hand is still able.' 'Let them take it easy! I shall not delay.' These words both rejoiced and alarmed us again. The sad image of death was always before our eyes, but we could do nothing but pray and wait.

"We passed the day in this anxiety. At last towards eight o'clock at night, finding him a little more oppressed, I wished to ease my disquietude and ascertain his state; I decided to be pressing if his condition demanded it. I said: "Prince, I am going to give an account of you to the Archbishop, who is very uneasy and troubled about you. Would you first of all sign your declaration, so that I can give him at the same time the sweet consolation of knowing that you are ready to appear in peace before God?' He had still an astonishing reserved strength so as to be able to answer: 'Thank the Archbishop; tell him everything will be done.' 'But when, good uncle?' resumed his young niece, who was near him at that moment. 'To-morrow,' he replied, 'between five and six in the morning.' 'To-morrow?' she continued. 'Yes, to-morrow, between five and six.' I signed then to Mdlle. de Perigord not to press him more, and I added myself, 'I may, then, Prince, give him this hope?' He quickly interrupted me. 'Don't say this hope, say this certainty; it is positive.' Those few words were spoken with such an extraordinary force and firmness as still surprises me, and which I still seem to hear.

"Towards nine o'clock Baron de Talleyrand's daughter, his young niece, who was to make her first Communion the next morning, came to say the customary goodby for the night. He received her with a kindness and gentleness which moved every one present. The child herself was silently moved; the scene visibly touched M. de Talleyrand to the heart."

Two hours after this, M. Cruveilhier, fearing that his intellect might be affected, it was deemed advisable to make another effort

to obtain his signature. Dupanloup was present, but another relates as follows what took place:

"At eleven o'clock I sent in Mdlle. de Perigord to the invalid's bedside; his present dispositions and the near ending of the time fixed, everything gave ground for hoping that this attempt would be successful and that the moment was favorable. M. Cruveilhier kept at some distance; I held a candle in my hand and raised the bed curtain. Mdlle. Pauline, holding a pen and two papers, drew near him. 'Good uncle,' she said, with a charming candor and affectionateness it is impossible to describe, 'you are at ease now; wouldn't you sign these two papers, the contents of which you approve? That will soothe you.' 'But it's not six o'clock,' replied the Prince. I admired the candor of this young girl, who, despite her earnest desire to see her dearest wishes realized, only colored and did not employ a word to alter the truth at a moment when a soul less pure would perhaps have had no scruple to utter a falsehood which would have appeared to her justified by the result. She did not then insist after the reply of the Prince, who said to her: 'I told you I would sign to-morrow between five and six in the morning; I promise you again to do it.'"

At half-past four the next morning Dupanloup, trembling with emotion, directed his steps towards Talleyrand's room, whither had already preceded him those whom he describes as the dying statesman's "angel guardians whom God had sent him." "What a spectacle and what a moment!" he writes. "We all kept silence. . . . The night had been peaceful, pain no longer showed itself by any outward indication; but there was no need for any self-illusion—the sick man's drawn features, his hollow cheeks, the very calmness of his oppression, everything told that the very strength to suffer was spent and that death was very near. A few rapid words, exchanged in a low voice, prompted a resolution which seemed urgent. It was going on five; it was the hour indicated by Talleyrand for signing his declaration; but we did not know that he would still have strength enough to affix his own signature to this document and the letter to the Pope that was to accompany it. In that case, foreseen by the Archbishop, grave witnesses were indispensable. That very instant they sent several carriages to various parts of the city to seek the necessary witnesses for that great and solemn moment. However, it reached daytime. The Duc de Poix, M. de Sainte-Aulaire, M. de Barante, M. Royer-Collard and M. Molé arrived successively; they were the witnesses summoned and apprised beforehand. It would be certainly difficult to select men of more honorable character and of higher authority. Their immediate intervention, as you will soon see, was not, however, necessary.

"It was M. de Talleyrand himself who first brought animation into this mute and motionless scene. He looked at all those around him, one after the other, with a slight smile and saluted them with a scarcely perceptible movement of his head; then, lowering his eyes, as if to collect his thoughts and quickly reopening them, we saw him, throwing off in some sort as he had done several times, the pain to which he remained a prey, reimpart to his face a new expression of life, resume an air of strength and heard him utter in a clear and firm voice these words: 'What o'clock is it?' A shivering ran through my veins; he remembered, then, the hour fixed by himself; he wished to be faithful to it! His brain had not then ceased to think; he was thinking still; his intelligence, his will was still full of life. The hour of salvation had then come. 'It is six o'clock,' replied some one. I don't know why my heart was troubled with the fear of deceiving him even by this answer, of depriving him of some of his merit, of owing the least bit of that supreme act to a surprise movement. 'Prince, it is hardly more than five o'clock,' I replied. 'Very well,' said the Prince in a calm voice, still master of himself and others; they were all astonished.

"God inspired me at that moment with a thought which became an imperishable memory to all who were witnesses of that moving scene. Everybody was up and afoot in the house, even that young child who the night before had bade such a touching farewell to her dying uncle and who that very day was going to make her first Communion in a few hours. The idea occurred to me to get her to see him again. It seemed to me that her presence would impart a sweet and salutary confidence to that soul about to appear before its Judge, would be a happy preparation for that grand act he was going to perform and like the last of the blessings of that great day. The young Marie de Talleyrand then came down, and at a moment when all, silent and reflective, could not avert our eyes or our thoughts from that deathbed, she suddenly made her appearance at the door of the room, with her timid and downcast eyes and pale face, completely attired in white. She really appeared like the angel of grace and forgiveness. A sudden change in the sick man's features revealed the deep emotion of his soul at the sight of her; his smile, his glances showed how charmed he was. The child first knelt at his feet and said: 'Uncle, I am going to pray to God for you; I ask your blessing.' It was a scene to melt the soul. We strangers drew a little aside so as not to disturb that last family scene, and then, raising himself with an effort, he said: 'My child, I wish you much happiness during your life, and if I can contribute to it in any way, I shall do it with all my heart.' 'You can do it by giving her your blessing,' said the Duchess de Dino. Then ex-

tending his hand he blessed her; the child burst into tears, but soon got up and retired. M. de Talleyrand's eyes followed her for a moment as she withdrew, and after casting a last glance at her, he turned towards M. de Bacourt and let fall these words: 'There are the two extremes of life; she is going to make her first Communion and I——' He did not finish the sentence.

"But directly six o'clock struck. Then we approached. At last we reached the long promised, long desired time. My mental agitation was no longer that uneasy and cruel trouble which had so often made me despondent. I was then almost sure of God's mercy; my heart was no longer agitated except with the hope of seeing religion and the Church soon consoled and one of the most ardent desires of my faith crowned. We advanced; M. de Bacourt supported M. de Talleyrand on the right side, the Duc de Valençay on the left; the Duchess de Dino and his daughter were at his feet; M. Cruveilhier, his physician, was behind one of the bed curtains; his old servant Helie behind the other; I remained standing farthest off. It has been said that the Duc de Poix, M. Molé, M. de Barante, M. Royer-Collard and M. de Sainte-Aulaire were near him; that is not exact. Those gentlemen remained at the open door of his room, but behind a half-closed portière, and. the documents were shown to them immediately after M. de Talleyrand signed them. At that moment Mdlle. Pauline, approaching, said: 'Good uncle, it is six o'clock. Do you wish I should present those papers to you which you promised to sign at this hour?' This movement drew him out of the deep thoughtfulness in which he was immersed for some moments; he raised his head. He was then seen to make a great effort to rise; weakness not permitting him, he had to be helped. Recovering in a moment from this shaking, he took the pen from the hands of Mdlle. Pauline. 'Monsieur de Talleyrand,' said Mdme. de Dino to him, 'do you wish me to read these papers before you sign them? You know them, but do you wish I should read them to you again?' 'Yes, read,' he replied. At these words, swayed, as it were, but a superior force and drawn towards him, all came together and drew near. With what eager attention, with what heart-throbbing, God knows! The Prince was seated on the edge of his bed and supported by cushions; his bearing was serious, his eyes raised and shut in an attitude and with an expression of the gravest attention. The Duchess de Dino advanced very close to him. As long as the reading lasted he listened, his head raised and erect, without showing the least sign of fatigue. His spirit was not only present, but one might say that he dominated that scene. Mdlle. de Perigord was kneeling near her mother; I was standing behind; M. Cruveilhier at the end of the room, and the old valet de

chambre leaning against the wooden bedstead and melted to tears. M. de Talleyrand had expressly requested that he should be present at that solemn hour; his servants were too numerous for all to be there; he wished that at least the oldest of them should represent them and be able to faithfully relate what his master had done and declared before dying. The Duchess de Dino, in presence of those assembled, first read his declaration, which you know, since the papers have published it. It is a long disowning of the worst and most celebrated epochs of his life and the candid condemnation of the age to which he belonged. At every sentence Mdme. de Dino begged him to note that it was his own wording; every time he made a sign of approval. In what Mdme. de Dino was reading there were things so grave that I was afraid M. de Talleyrand could not bear the expressions. I was tempted to ask the Duchess de Dino, who was being carried away by her emotion, to moderate the tone of her voice; I feared that the humiliation was too much.

"The reading of the declaration ended—it had lasted about ten minutes—M. de Talleyrand received the document from the Duchess de Dino's hands; he took it with his left hand; during the reading he had continuously held upright in his right the pen they had first given him, and without the least sign of uncertainty or hesitation, without any kind of extraordinary change in his face or features, without altering a word, with a firm and steady hand he began to write his name. The pen not tracing a letter, because the ink had dried during the reading, he dipped it himself in the ink bottle held up to him, and he then, in characters perfectly traced, affixed his grand signature, what he only used in great diplomatic treaties—'Charles-Maurice, Prince de Talleyrand.'"

The Duchess de Dino having read to him his letter to the Pope, which he similarly signed, she asked him whaa date he wished to put to it, and he replied very emphatically, "The week of my discourse at the Academy." It was, therefore, dated March 10, seven days after its delivery, at his direction. "This reply," observes Dupanloup, "had a kind of electrical effect upon all present; all were seized with admiration at the sight of ahat man of firm will, always strong, clear and master of himself, who, almost in the arms of death, was acting with calmness and authority, as when in his fullest vigor, deciding alone and with rigorous and thoughtful precision the details of the greatest affair he ever had to deal with. I drew aside and alone on my knees gave thanks to God for His mercies and asked Him to finish His work, for I was preoccupied about the Prince's confession, although no longer presented any obstacle. This confession, besides, was not difficult to obtain after what had taken place; he had even signed the important documents

addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff and made his peace with the Church—an indispensable condition of the peace he wished to make with God before dying. It was also less difficult to make after private conversations which had already prepared and happily begun it two days previously. M. de Talleyrand had taken it into serious consideration for several days beforehand. When I again saw him it was about eight o'clock. There was great commotion in the whole house. This commotion was perceptible even in the Prince's room, where I saw everybody about him agitated. The King's presence was announced to him. I then withdrew once more, deeply regretting that his confession had not preceded this visit. Everything that might upset him in his weak state made me afraid. The effect of this visit on the Prince's condition was very great. He fell into a state of dejection which was alarming; there was a very great change in his features, and, although his breathing still indicated much vitality, when we spoke to him he no longer replied. They came to tell me. I made haste, pierced to the soul by this painful spectacle. What was to be done? To pray and wait. He was profoundly absorbed. This state lasted for more than two hours; my uneasiness and embarrassment were at their height. At that moment I got a letter from the Archbishop which raised my courage; it was full of a zeal so apostolic and the joy of such a lively faith that my zeal and faith were also revived. It was Providence sent me that letter; it served me as an introduction to the Prince. I went to him. "Prince," I said. At this he opened his eyes, which he fixed on me; he even tried to smile. "Prince, the Archbishop directs me to tell you how concerned he is about you, how grieved he is about your state, how dear you are to him . . . On hearing me he seemed very moved and grateful; in his countenance there was that something indescribably sad but tender which sometimes gives a touching expression to the faces of the dying. He had still strength enough to say in a weak but distinct voice: 'I am very sensible of the Archbishop's kindness; I thank him . . . much.' I interrupted him to spare him the fatigue of a prolonged effort. 'The Archbishop,' I added, 'blesses God above all for your courage in consoling religion and setting your conscience at . . . Yes, Prince, you have this morning given the Church great consolation; I now come in the name of the Church to offer you the last consolations of your faith, the last succors of religion. You are reconciled to the Catholic Church, which you afflicted. The moment has come to reconcile yourself also with God by a new avowal and by a sincere repentance for all the faults of your life.' Then he made a movement as if to advance towards me; I approached, and at once both his hands seized mine and, pressing them with extraordinary

strength and emotion, he never relaxed his grasp all the time his confession lasted; it even needed a great effort to disengage my hand from his when the moment came to give him absolution. He received it with a humility, an emotion, a faith which made me shed tears and which doubtless touched God's heart and caused to descend upon that humbled head mercy and pardon. After his absolution I could not leave him; I do not know what powerful ties bound me to his side. I had, however, to leave him rest from a fatigue which must have been very great in his weak state. I wished to withdraw; it was then, raising his failing eyes towards me, he called me back, and again grasping my hands affectionately, uttered very distinctly these words: 'Kindly tell the Archbishop——' he continued, but his extreme weakness did not allow him to speak loud enough to be heard. The Duc de Valençay and M. de Bacourt, who supported his head at that moment, and I approached and said: 'Prince, what do you wish me to tell the Archbishop?' He made another effort and resumed: 'Kindly tell him that I——' Again he continued, but we could not grasp the meaning of the words which his lips, rather long moving, visibly uttered. To give him ease and spare him a fatigue it was painful to witness, I myself pursued: 'It is certain, Prince that the Archbishop is deeply devoted to you—to you and all your family, and you know how much he loved and venerated the pious Cardinal Perigord, your uncle.' 'And you know, uncle,' said the Duc de Valençay, 'how attached the Archbishop has always been to you above all.' 'To the extent,' I added, 'that this morning again he said to me that he would willingly give his life for you.' At these words his emotion was extreme; he made a great effort and we very distinctly heard these words: 'Tell him that he has a much better use to make of it.' Then he relapsed into a kind of prostration, the alarming and sad repose of which we wished at least to respect. I did not delay, however, administering to him extreme unction. At that moment his room was full not only of members of his family who had reëntered, but a crowd of friends who thronged round his death-bed. I applied the holy oils to his eyes, which he closed; to his lips and to his breast; he was evidently fully conscious and constantly gave us touching proofs of it to his last breath. Particularly I shall never forget this: I did not think it my duty to recite the Litany of the Saints until after I had applied all the holy oils, and placed myself near him at his side, however, and at some distance. Solely engaged in praying, I only looked at him from time to time. Suddenly my prayer was interrupted; it was observed that he was making responses; that his lips were repeating the words of the Litany, 'Pray for us,' 'Have mercy on us.' And when among the holy martyrs I came to St. Maurice and pro-

nounced his name, he recognized his patron saint. We saw him bow his head, and his glance, his smile, his prayer sought my eyes to give me to understand that he united himself to my prayers, then he closed his eyes, but the movement of his lips continued to testify that he joined in our intentions and was praying along with us. When some moments afterwards among the holy Pontiffs I uttered the name of St. Charles, his other patron, the same thing occurred in as marked a manner; his glance again sought mine; he expressed a sensible consolation in making me again note how these prayers touched him. Towards three o'clock, seeing the hour coming, I began the prayers for the agonizing. M. de Talleyrand, although at the last moment, evidently was fully conscious; he was even praying with admirable humility and fervor. My attention was drawn to it again. 'Monsieur l'abbê', they said, 'see how he is praying!'

"However, he was visibly near the end; death was present. I recommenced the prayers for the agonizinz. But at that moment what prayers, what tears, what silence! Nothing, my friend, could depict for you the scene which then took place beside that death-bed. When I opened by Breviary to read the admirable prayer of the Church for the Christian in his agony my voice, despite me, was broken with emotion and my saddened gaze, involuntarily falling again on that face discolored by death, I could not find strength to speak. At last after a violent effort I was able to utter in a trembling and broken voice those first words: 'Go forth, Christian soul.' At these words, while I was restrained by emotion, all the numerous persons present by an unanimous and spontaneous movement fell on their knees. The sad dènouement took place before my eyes; our gaze was then fixed on those livid and motionless lips. Only for one instant during the public prayers for his agony did we see him, his eyes sometimes open, sometimes lowered, follow with signs of perfect intelligence all that was taking place around him and again answer us with that smile which never left him except in death. All at once his head dropped. Then M. de Bacourt, one of the most honorable men Divine Providence placed near him in his last moments, tried to gently raise his head to support it. The dying man's hand, already cold, moved in that of his friend and family, pressed it again; he turned his eyes for the last time towards him, but it was the last sign of life he gave. Everybody present understood, and all kneeling round his bed, seeing the last movements of his lips, we saw them close forever. M. de Talleyrand had ceased to live and suffer. It was the 17th of May, 1838, at thirty-five minutes past three in the afternoon."

When Royer Collard met the Abbé Dupanloup after this memorable sick-call he grasped his hand and said: "Monsieur l'abbé, vous êtes un prêtre!" The Parisians, however, with the skepticism born

of their ineradicable légèrete, disbelieved, or affected to disbelieve, the conversion of Talleyrand, which some witling of the time made the subject of the following not very reverential quatrain:

> Il a trompé du même coup
> (Si ce n'est vrai, c'est vraisemblable),
> Le bon Dieu, le monde et le diable,
> Et de Quelen et Dupanloup."

The late Bishop of Orleans, some years before his death, referring to this remarkable incident in the early part of his career, said: "Since I have mentioned the four Bishops who had the misfortune to forget their duty in the day of peril,[2] I shall say that he who died the last, he whose more deplorable errors, deeper fall, longer and more celebrated life are in everybody's mmory, was also touched by the hand of Divine mercy in his last hour. I have received his last sigh, and it is known that before appearing before God—and he had not even postponed it to that supreme day—he deplored his life, blamed the Revolution and condemned the acts of his sad episcopate."

R. F. O'Connor.

Dublin, Ireland.

[2] The four who took the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy at the time of the French Revolution.

THE GUTENBERG BIBLES.

THE year 1450 was a milestone in the history of the invention of printing. It was the year when Gutenberg entered upon the gigantic task of printing the first Latin Bible. This date of the first Bible that appeared in print is established beyond doubt.[1] Yet there remains another probem, linked with this fact, the solution of which is beset with greater difficulties. If it is an assured fact that a Bible was printed in 1450, we naturally ask the question, Are there any copies of the first impression still extant? Apparently it seems impossible to search for such. We know that the first printed books were issued without notice of date and printer's name.[2] We seem, therefore, to be at a loss to single out from the numerous undated Bibles still left those printed by Gutenberg. Nevertheless bibliographers make certain features of undated books disclose the date or printer's name to us. We are not concerned now with this branch of scientific bibliography. Suffice it

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. XIX., 1912, No. 16, p. 461 sq.
[2] *Fortnightly Review*, op. cit., No. 13, p. 391.

to state here that two undated editions of the Latin Bible can claim the honor of being the products of Gutenberg's printing activity and that several copies of each edition still exist. They are now always styled the "36 line" and "42 line" Bibles, from the number of lines of the columns.[3] For brevity's sake we shall designate them henceforth as "B 36" and "B 42," respectively. We follow herein the prevailing custom among bibliographers.[4]

Since the beginning of the sixteenth century many attempts were made to rob Gutenberg of the glory of being the inventor of printing. The various myths springing up in various places and creating various mythical inventors—the products partly of family pride, partly of local patriotism, partly of ignorance—eclipsed almost entirely the memory of the real inventor for more than two centuries. It was only in 1740, at the time of the celebration of the third centenary of the invention,[5] that the fame of the real originator of printing was reawakened.[6] In like manner Gutenberg's typographical activity had faded from memory. Up to the year 1740 the Gutenberg Bibles had been lost sight of and had been completely forgotten.[7] True it is that the famous "Cologne Chronicle" of 1499 relates that Gutenberg had printed a Latin Bible in 1450; it knows of but one Gutenberg Bible.[8] The next witness, Joh. Trithemius, does not add, in 1513, anything more definite to this bare statement of 1499.[9] A short time after Gutenberg and his Bibles were buried in oblivion till toward the end of the seventeenth century a few authors commenced to reiterate the vague statement that a Latin Bible had been printed at Mayence in 1450.[10] None of those writers was aware of the existence of such a Bible, and likewise none of them knew the name of the printer. The Gutenberg Bibles had to be rediscovered from under the dust of the cloister—and church libraries.[11]

The first author who had a knowledge of a Gutenberg Bible and referred to it as still extant in 1740 was Christ. Gottlieb Schwarz.[12]

---

[3] *Fortnightly Review*, op. cit., p. 391.

[4] Cp. K. Dziatzko. "Gutenberg Frueheste Druckerpraxis," Berlin, 1890; p. 1, note 1.

[5] An erroneous date, cp. *Fortnightly Review*, op. cit., No. 16, p. 463.

[6] K. Schorbach. "Die urkundl. Naachricht. ueb. Joh. Gutenberg, in Festschrift z. fuenfhundertjaehr." Geburtstag. v. J. Gutenberg, Lips. u. Mayence, 1900, p. 236.

[7] Dziatzko, op. cit., p. 4.

[8] Dziatzko, pp. 1-2; A. v. d. Linde. Gesch. der Erfind. d. Buchdruckerk. I., Berlin, 1886, p. 332; III., Berlin, 1886, p. 818.

[9] Dziatzko, pp. 3-4; Linde. I., pp. 57-58.

[10] Dziatzko, p. 6, note 2.

[11] Dziatzko, p. 1.

[12] "Primaria quaedam documenta de origine typogr." (Altorfif. 1740), p. 4 sq.

But the indefiniteness of his description leaves it doubtful whether he had in mind B 42 or B 36.[13] In 1754 we come across the first unequivocal description of an actual copy of the Gutenberg B 36, G. L. O. Knoch[14] gives an account of the copy of B 36 in the library at Wolfenbuettel, but assigns it erroneously to two German printers of Venice and to the years 1470-1480.[15] More attention was attracted to B 36 six years later by the booklet of Joh. Georg Schelhorn, "De Antiquiss, Latinorum Bibliorum editione."[16] It gives a detailed description of a second copy of B 36, of which Schelhorn was the happy possessor, which is now preserved in the library at Stuttgart. Schelhorn was the first man to designate B 36 as the first printed Bible. B 42 was quite unknown to him.[17] Meanwhile a copy of B 42 had been discovered. In 1752 J. Oelrich described the copy preserved now in the Royal Library at Berlin.[18] The first account, however, of the B 42 is still five years older. The "Berlinische Bibliothek" contains[19] notices of the B 42 at Berlin. The authors of this first description of B 42 conjectured rightly when they designated this Bible in question as the oldest extant.[20] The comparison of different copies soon revealed that B 42 is a different edition from B 36. Gerhard Meermann recognized both Gutenberg Bibles as early as 1761[21] and 1765[22] as two distinct editions. Unfortunately he regarded B 36 as not being a genuine work of Gutenberg. According to his view B 42 must be regarded as the sole and unique Gutenberg Bible—as *the* Gutenberg Bible.[23] In the course of time he gained many adherents of both contentions. This point will claim our attention later on. But the greatest attention was drawn to the copy of B 42 in the Cardinal Mazarin's library at Paris. G. Fr. de Bure unearthed it and described it first in 1763.[24] From this copy B 42 was formerly styled the "Mazarine Bible."[25] This designation was a misnomer. The great Cardinal's name is now

---

13 Dziatzko, p. 5.

14 Hist.-Crit. Nachrichten v. d. Bibelsamml. zu Braunschweig . . . 9. Stueck (Hannover, 1754), p. 724 sq.

15 Dziatzko, p. 6; Linde, III., p. 823.

16 Ulmae, 1760.

17 Dziatzko, pp. 6-7, Linde, III., pp. 823-824.

18 "Entwurf einer Gesch.," d. Koenigl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, 1752, p. 27 (Linde, III., p. 871).

19 Vol. I. (Berlin, 1747), pp. 269 and 429.

20 Andr. Gottl. Masch. Bibliotheca Sacra. P. II., Vol. III. (Halae, 1783), p. 68.

21 "Conspectus originum typographicar." (Haag., 1761), p. 43, note 1, and p. 46, note.

22 "Origines typographicae I." (Haag, Paris, London, 1765), p. 150, notae, p. 284 sq.

23 Dziatzko, p. 7; Linde, III., p. 824.

24 "Bibliographie instructive," Vol. I., Paris, 1763, p. 32, No. 25.

25 W. A. Copinger, "Incunabula Biblica," London, 1892, p. 1.

entirely dropped as an appellative of the forty-second line Gutenberg Bible.[26] Still the erroneous view created by the improper appellation "Mazarine" is retained by writers of note like Copinger,[27] Kapp,[28] British Museum catalogue[29] that the "Mazarine Bible" had been the first recognized copy of B 42. As mentioned above, the Berlin copy had been brought to light sixteen years before the discovery of the Mazarine copy.

All these happy coincidences had roused the curiosity of the bibliographers and bibliophiles to a high degree. Succeeding finds of Gutenberg Bibles accentuated this enthusiasm for the first printed Bibles. Within the lapse of a few decades some copies had passed through several hands. A few Gutenberg Bibles were dragged from their quiet repositories in the libraries of monasteries and churches, were thrown on the book market, to land either in some public library or in the castles of the French and English bibliophiles. The B 42 now in the National Library at Paris had been safely kept, in 1767, in the Benedictine Library at Mayence and was transported in 1788 to its present resting place.[30]

The copy of B 36, which had been a treasure of the Benedictine Library at Metten, Bavaria, in 1788, was bought some time before 1803 by the English bibliophile, Lord Spencer, and is now an attraction of the John Rylands Library at Manchester, England.[31] More checkered is the story of the B 42, which is now in the British Museum in London. Having been in the possession of the French bibliophile, Gaignat, in 1769, it was sold successively to two French bibliophiles, Girardot de Préfond and Count MacCarthy Reagh, then passed over to England by the purchase of the English bibliophile, Thomas Grenville, of London, in 1817 and arrived in 1847 at its present destination.[32] In 1792 two copies of B 42 were sold at auction in Paris. They had belonged to the library of the ill-famed Cardinal Loménie de Brienne (d. 1794) and had come there, in all probability, as spoils from the suppressed French monasteries. The one of these copies was purchased by the Bodleian Library, Oxford, in 1793, to all appearance. The second copy could not be identified as yet among the existent copies.[33] The B 42 of the Munich Library had quietly rested on the shelves of the Benedictine Library of

---

[26] Copinger, l. c.

[27] Copinger.

[28] Gesch. d. d. Buchhand. I Lips., 1886, p. 45.

[29] British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books. Bible. P. I., London, 1892, p. 16.

[30] Linde, III., p. 877; P. Schwenke. Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. erst. Buchdrucks, Berlin, 1900, p. 3.

[31] Linde, III., p. 825; Copinger, op. cit., p. 9.

[32] Linde, III., p. 876; Schwenke, op. cit., p. 5; Copinger, p. 4.

[33] Linde, III., pp. 876 and 879; Schwenke, pp. 5 and 7 sq.

Andechs, Bavaria, till 1803. After the suppression of the monastery it was confiscated and transported to Munich, May, 1805.[34] The B 42 of the Monastery of the Augustinian Canons of Rottenbuch, Bavaria, was likewise seized by the Bavarian Government after the suppression of the monastery and taken to Munich in 1803. Since 1858 it is a valuable part of the Imperial Library, of St. Petersburg.[35] One more incident may bring to a close this rather incomplete list of Gutenberg Bibles which had changed hands from 1769 to 1805. The private library of the last elector and Archbishop of Mayence, Fred. Charles Joseph Baron, of Erthal (d. 1802), contained a copy of B 42, which was added to the Royal Library at Aschaffenburg,[36] Bavaria; there it still remains.

These rapid finds brought about, as a matter of course, a better valuation of the Gutenberg Bibles. The tentative descriptions of a few decades ago developed soon into scientific comparisons of the two editions and their different copies. The learned abbot, Martin Gerbert, pointed out as early as 1767[37] two important peculiarities of the B 42 in his library at St. Blaise, Baden, which he could not detect in the B 36, now in Stuttgart.[38] A more minute comparison, based on more copies, was instituted by A. G. Masch in 1783.[39] He adduces some proofs which establish the fact that B 36 and B 42 were actually the first printed Bibles.[40] He, moreover, lays down certain canons whereby different editions of undated Bibles can be recognized.[41] He, too, is the first bibliographer to all appearances who raised the question as to the priority among the two Bibles printed by Gutenberg. He refrained from passing any judgment on the point,[42] but gave simply B 36 the first place on account of the great number of leaves.[43]

The question which of these two Bibles was printed *first* constituted from this time a regularly recurring moot point among bibliographers.[44] Two diametrically opposite opinions held their own for the lapse of an entire century. Still the problem remained unsolved. Some writers laid greater stress on the similarity of the

---

34 Linde, III., p. 875; Schwenke, p. 3.
35 Linde, III., p. 879; Schwenke, p. 5; Copinger, p. 5.
36 Linde, III., p. 871; Schwenke, p. 2.
37 "Reisen durch Alemannien," Ulm, 1767, p. 148.
38 Linde, III., p. 872.
39 "Bibliotheca Sacra," P. II., V. III. Halae, 1783, p. 64-68.
40 Op. cit., p. 64.
41 Op. cit., pp. 63-64 and 56-57.
42 Op. cit., pp. 58 and 64.
43 Op. cit., pp. 64-67. How unreliable this criterion of older bibliographers is in regard to the pre-Reformation German Bibles is shown by Walther, "Die Deutsche Bibeluebersetz. des Mittelalt.," Braunschweig, 1889, p. 15.
44 Dziatzko, p. 8.

types of B 36 with those of Pfister's printings and put down B 36 as a product of Pfister's press. On this supposition B 36 was later than B 42 and the latter was the one genuine Gutenberg Bible. Others, on the contrary, emphasized the greater resemblance of the type of B 36 to the so-called Missal types and assigned the first place to B 36, considering B 42 as the second Gutenberg Bible.[45] Only a few modern names may find a place here.[46] B 42, being the first, was defended by Henry Stevens,[47] E. C. Bigmore and C. W. H. Wyman,[48] Wendell Prime.[49] The cause of B 36 claiming the distinction to be the first Bible, was most ardently pleaded of late by J. P. A. Madden,[50] Theo. L. De Vinne,[51] Anthony v. der Linde,[52] J. H. Hessels[53] and J. Janssen.[54] In view of these conflicting opinions and on account of rather weak arguments on both sides some authors refrained from taking any side, as of late Fred. Kapp[55] and Chr. Brunn.[56] An adequate solution of this knotty problem was found happily some time ago. Before putting forward the final result of scientific research we must first lay down the specious proofs for the alleged priority of B 36 over B 42 and point out the overdrawn inferences.

The supporters of the priority of B 36 draw their main argument from its typographical peculiarities. The *Chronicle,* of Cologne,, vouches for the undeniable fact that the first Latin Bible of 1450 was printed with the large types, used generally later in the various editions of the Missal.[57] The first printed Bible was brought out in large types, the so-called Missal types. From this typographical feature the supporters of the priority of B 36 think they could trace the first printed Bible. The starting point, they argue, is found easily. We have to single out of the two Gutenberg Bibles the one endowed with the characteristics indicated by Zell, or, to speak more precisely, we have to fix upon that Bible which bears best the distinctive mark mentioned already, and we have to exclude the one which shows the greater dissimilarity from Missal types.

---

45 Dziatzko, p. 14.

46 A larger list in Dziatzko, pp. 15, 16, note 2.

47 "Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition," London, 1878, p. 43 sq.

48 "Bibliography of Printing, I.," London, 1880, p. 288.

49 "Fifteenth Century Bibles," New York, 1888, p. 35 sq., 55 sq.

50 "Lettres d'un bibliophile," III. série, Paris, 1874, p. 50 sq.

51 "The Invention of Printing," London and New York, 1877, p. 414 sq.

52 "Gutenberg," Stuttgart, 1878, p. 54, and "Gesch. d. Erfind. d. Buchdruckkunst," Vol. III., Berlin, 1886, pp. 819, 867, 880 sq. and passim.

53 "Haarlem, the Birthplace of Printing," London, 1887, p. 21 sq.

54 "Kirchenlexicon s. v. Buchdruckerk," Vol. II., edit. II., Friburg., 1883, col. 1393

55 "Gesch. d. d. Buchhandels I.," Lips., 1886, p. 45 sq.

56 "De nyeste Undersog," Copenhag., 1889, p. 43 sq.

57 Linde, I., p. 331 sq.; III., 818; Dziatzko, p. 2.

This requirement now is fulfilled in B 36. A minute comparison with various printed Missals reveals the fact that B 42 does not answer the description of printing with Missal types; B 42 cannot be the first printed Bible.[58]

This contention is settled now beyond any doubt by a minute typographical comparison of the two Gutenberg Bibles. All bibliographers of late regard as certain that B 42 as well as B 36 were executed with Missal types. This unanimous conviction is the happy result of the painstaking researches of K. Dziatzko.[59] The ain features of the types of B 36 and B 42 are completely identical. Minor differences are the use of larger and especially more extended types in B 36. There was prevalent a telling regard for saving space when the types of B 42 were cast: This mania of saving space of B 42 is still better witnessed than in the type bodies in the fact that the letters expand almost to the very margin, and in the absence of spacing come to stand closely together. Moreover, certain letters were often combined into fixed ligatures.[60] In B 36 ligatures were used more sparingly; besides, the types of B 36 were heavier.[61] The height of the lines of B 42 and B 36 has the ratio of about 17.8 to 21 typographical points respectively. The width of equal printing of the identical words stands in the ratio of about 17 to 21 typographical points. In places where B 42 alone makes use of ligatures the ratio rises even to about 17.2 to 24 typographical points. These peculiarities of the types give the print of B 42 a condensed appearance, in striking contrast to the largeness and heaviness of the single types and to the otherwise beautiful make-up of the book. This was probably the reason why those writers quoted above denied the Missal printing of B 42.[62] Since both Gutenberg Bibles were executed with Missal types, we are at a loss to determine the priority of any of them, relying on the statement of the *Chronicle,* of Cologne, regarding the Bible of 1450. The supporters of the priority of B 36 based their argument on the wrong supposition that B 42 is no Missal print. Their reasoning, therefore, does not conclude.

The second argument advanced in favor of B 36 is deduced from the larger print and the corresponding smaller number of lines on each page of B 36. Gutenberg, they argue, had printed first B 36. But, seeing that this book had become too voluminous (882 leaves, 1,764 pages), he tried his luck later in printing a new edition of the Bible with smaller types and more lines to a page. He started

---

[58] Linde, III., 819.

[59] "Gutenberg's frueheste Druckerpraxis," Berlin, 1890, p. 2, 50 sq.

[60] Dziatzko, op. cit., p. 50.

[61] Dziatzko, p. 2.

[62] Dziatzko, pp. 50-51, p. 2.

in with printing forty lines on a page (pages 1-9), but soon raised the number to forty-one (page 10) and finally (page 11) to forty-two lines throughout the entire work. The gradual development of the typographical technique is taken for a strict proof of the priority of B 36. There is a steady raise of the number of printing lines to be witnessed in the three first editions of the Bible. To proceed from the B 36 (of 1450) to the B 40-42 (of 1456) and again to the B 48 (of 1462) was a technical progress. Reverting this order and placing B 42 first would constitute an unreasonable retrogression.[63]

An additional proof is drawn by the supporters of B 36 from the gradual increase of the lines in the two Gutenberg Bibles. The first printers were ever more eager to produce cheaper editions of books by using ever smaller types. In 1462 they had arrived already at the forty-eight line Bible, as was mentioned above. Gutenberg himself printed in 1460 even sixty-six lines on the pages of his "Catholicon." This habit of crowding more and more lines on the pages of books is found the more reasonable from a business standpoint, considering that a single copy of B 36 on vellum required the hides of a small herd of sheep over and above a corresponding copy of B 42. That Gutenberg was moved by such considerations is proven by the fact adduced above that his B 42 was planned originally as a B 40. The supporters of the priority of B 36 seize upon this fact as an evidence for their view. It is incredible, they argue, that Gutenberg, supposing that B 42 is the first Bible, should have, after the issue of the excellent B 42, hit upon the thought that he could do better business with an edition occupying one-fourth more space without giving more text, and whose production was necessarily more expensive on account of its larger volumes.[64]

The priority of B 36 is, moreover, seemingly corroborated by the passion of saving space in B 42. The letters covering the type bodies to their very edges and the excessive use of ligatures in B 42, mentioned above, stand in correlation with the utilization of the printing space. The thirty-six lines of B 36 measure fully a height of eleven and a half inches.[65] The forty-two lines of B 42 measure somewhat less, eleven and a third inches.[66] The width of a single column of B 36 extends to about three inches and a third,[67] and the width of both columns, the free space in the middle included, to about seven and two-third inches.[68] The width of a single colum

[63] Linde, III., p. 827.
[64] "Otto Hartwig in: Festschrift z. fuenfhundertj." Geburtstage v. J. Gutenberg, Lips. and Mayence, 1900, p. 18.
[65] More correctly, 11,65352 inches=29,6 cm.
[66] More correctly, 11,33856 inches=28,8 cm. They seem to lower later to closely 11,29919 inches=28,7 cm.
[67] More correctly, 3,34645 inches=8,5 cm.
[68] Precisely 7,67715 inches=19,5 cm.

of B 42 is a little more extended, as well as is the width of both columns combined. The addition in a single column of B 42 over the corresponding column in B 36 varies from 0.03937 to 0.07874 inches (1-2mm). The two columns combined, with their empty space in the middle, add the same amount, 0.03937-0.07874 inches, to the corresponding columns in B 36.[69] The smaller size of the printing surface of B 42 is almost made good by the greater width of the columns and the smaller middle space. This is apparently a technical improvement and presupposes a less economical edition to have gone before.

None of these proofs carries conviction. We must admit the principle that smaller print and numerical increase of lines bespeaks a later edition. Yet there are exceptions to this rule, and B 36 is one of them. The judicious use made of the space implies greater skill in printing. But this does not necessitate the inference that the printer of B 42 must have tried his skill before on B 36. He had tried it on other books.

The smaller number of copies printed of B 36 is alleged as an ulterior evidence of its priority. The inventor of printing was confronted at the outset of his business by the trade of books made by handicraft and by single pieces. The sale of printed books was yet an uncertain quantity. It was quite natural that he considered the mechanical manifolding of a few dozens of copies by printing as an extraordinary triumph of his art. Of course, the sale of such a limited edition of such a big work could not cover the expenses. Indeed, Gutenberg had bad luck with his first Bible.[70] Experience is a wise teacher. Gutenberg had learned something of the sale of printed books by the time he issued a second edition of the Bible. He published a great number of copies of B 42. This enlarged issue evinces again the priority of B 36 over B 42.[71]

All this is but a piece of specious reasoning. Raising the number of copies may be the effect of growing trade. It may also be quite the contrary, the first venture of an incipient trade finding yet no competition. In this supposition the large edition precedes the smaller one. B 42 precedes B 36.[72] This was actually the case, as we know now for certain.

The supporters of the priority of B 36 are not yet at a loss for proofs for their espoused cause. In some copies of B 42 five headings are printed in red. There is no red print in B 36. This absence of red color in B 36 is pointed out as an instance against the

[69] Dziatzko, pp. 24 and 29. The measurements given by Linde, III., p. 827, note, are somewhat general.

[70] Linde, III., p. 818.

[71] Linde, III., p. 879.

[72] Dziatzko, p. 33.

priority of B 42.[73] But this very illogical reasoning. The printer of B 42 himself gave up this usage very soon. The printer of B 36 followed later his predecessor's custom of dropping red print altogether.[74] This was the actual sequel of things.

Again, another technical feature is adduced as evidence of the claim of B 36. Both Bibles leave space for the capital letter F of the prologue, which the illuminator had to paint by hand. Now B 42 shortens six lines to leave ample room, whereas B 36 shortens only two lines. This greater limitation in B 36 should be a clear indication of its priority.[75] But this plea rests on a false assumption. There is no uniform system regarding the number of lines shortened to give room for the initial letter of a new section.[76] Therefore the fact adduced neither proves nor disproves anything.

Both types are very similar to each other, even as to particularities, so that one was the prototype or pattern for the other.[77] The writers, favoring the claim of priority of B 36, regard the larger and more massive types of B 36 as the older ones. This fact should serve as an additional corroboration of their opinion.[78] But the question of priority cannot be settled by slight variance of types.[79] There are two opposite possibilities in this regard. The types of B 36 may have been an enlarged copy of type B 42 or the latter may have been a smaller reproduction of the former.[80] There are adherents of either the one or the other opinion. But granted the priority of the type B 36, which seems to be the saner view, the priority of the *printing* is not yet implied by it.[81] Quite often an older type was used in later editions.

B 42 makes use of one more sign of punctuation. This insignificant incident is construed as evidence of the priority of B 36. The more limited number of these signs may have been an awkwardness compared with the subsequent more perfect B 42. It may have been just the reverse—a reduction on account of greater convenience by the later printer of B 36.[82] Nothing, therefore, can be evinced by this fact.

Finally, we mention some accessory typographical features which appear to favor the claim of priority of B 36. The printer of B 42 had more capital on hand, since the necessary paper had been bought almost all at the start, whereas the limited means of the printer of

[73] Linde, III., p. 867.
[74] Dziatzko, pp. 48, 82, 84, 85, note 1.
[75] Linde, III., p. 867.
[76] Dziatzko, p. 80.
[77] Dziatzko, p. 51.
[78] Linde, III., p. 867.
[79] Dziatzko, pp. 63, 74, 86.
[80] Schwenke, op. cit., p. 87.
[81] Dziatzko, p. 86.
[82] Dziatzko, p. 69.

B 36 allowed him to buy material for but a part at a time.[83] More typesetters worked simultaneously on B 42 than on B 36, as is evinced by the ten different sections of printing. A larger and better equipped printing office and a printer of better means produced B 42.[84] A simple printing apparatus was in operation on B 36.[85] The types of B 42 were executed with more care and forethought and were made seemingly of better material. Perhaps the types of B 36 were manufactured in a hurry.[86] B 42 paid more attention to a clear and legible print, whereas the many abbreviations and the apparently greater haste in issuing B 36 were the cause that the latter falls short in this regard.[87] Finally, B 42 is printed with more uniformity and consistency, coupled with greater variety in minor points.[88] But all of these peculiarities support the assumption of the priority of B 42 as well as of B 36.

None of the proofs mentioned above establishes the priority of B 36. Such typographically singular features may create at the most some kind of plausibility on either the one or the other side.[89] The supporters of the priority of B 42 pitted other typographical peculiarities against the pretentious proofs for the priority of B 36. But they were not able to carry their point, either. Plausibilities were set against plausibilities. A stringent argument could not be adduced by either party of the contestants.[90] The solution of the problem could be solved only by a textual comparison of the two Bibles.[91] The first man who undertook this scientific research systematically[92] was also the first man who gave the final solution of the problem. This man was the noted bibliographer, Charles Dziatzko (d. 1903). His results are laid down in his work, "Gutenberg's Earliest Printing Practice" (Gutenberg's Frueheste Druckerpraxis), Berlin, 1890, pp. 87-112.

The comparison evinced the coincidence of both Bibles in their orthography, punctuation, correct and wrong readings.[93] Particularly pronounced is this mutual agreement regarding orthographical matters in chapters containing a great amount of proper names, like Genesis, chs. 5, 10, 35, 36. While the different manuscripts teem with various readings, these two Bibles have very few and trifling

---

[83] Dziatzko, pp. 49, 40, 74.
[84] Dziatzko, p. 31.
[85] Dziatzko, p. 74.
[86] Dziatzko, p. 74.
[87] Dziatzko, p. 75.
[88] Dziatzko, p. 86.
[89] Dziatzko, p. 17.
[90] Dziatzko, p. 17.
[91] Dziatzko, p. 87.
[92] Dziatzko, p. 1.
[93] Dziatzko, p. 87.

variants.[94] More important is the uniformity in the use of punctuation marks, since the caprice and the free choice of the individual printer have fuller scope usually in this matter than in the domain of orthography. There is an agreement to be found even in their inconsistent and faulty punctuations.[95] The comparison of the texts proper discovered errors of faulty readings common to both Bibles.[96] Moreover, both Bibles have often identical ends or beginnings of chapters which differ from those of the manuscript Bibles. Finally, the order of succession of the two verses of Exodus, chap. 21, vs. 16-17, is reverted in both Bibles in the same way. These facts prove beyond any doubt that one Bible is a reprint of the other. Yet the question which is the first printed is left in abeyance. As a rule, B 42 gives a more correct text. Most of the errors of B 42 are found in B 36, and only a few faults of B 42 are corrected in B 36. These rare emendations occur always in instances when gross errors of B 42 are expunged which could have been easily noticed and corrected without consulting the manuscript copy.[97] This fact gives color to the assumption that B 42 preceded B 36. Yet it cannot be taken as a solid proof of such a precedence.

The favorable position of B 42 is strengthened by the following consideration: Reverting this order and placing B 36 first, the printer of B 42 would have been constrained to correct the text of B 36 in very many places. To get the reading we actually find in B 42 the editor of it would have had to emend the text of B 36 partly from his own knowledge, partly by consulting a good manuscript of the Bible. B 42 can be a reprint of B 36 only through an extensive use of the manuscript. Since such editorial activity is not an impossible presupposition, it was a mistake to infer the priority of B 42 from its more correct text. The variants of the two Bibles could have been explained always on the assumption that the editor of B 42 took B 36 as his base and consulted the manuscript Bible whenever he suspected errors in the original B 36.[98] There were no variants which would compel one to regard one of the Bibles as the later one.[99]

Still *one* passage was found which rendered the priority of B 36 very doubtful. B 42 makes use of the third form of transitions from one chapter to the other in the fourth book of Esdras, chapter the first (Vol. I., f. 247v., line 24 sqq.). This form consists in putting a small word or part of a word which cannot find a place on

[94] Dziatzko, p. 88.
[95] Dziatzko, p. 89.
[96] Dziatzko, p. 90.
[97] Dziatzko, p. 91.
[98] Dziatzko, pp. 92 sq.
[99] Dziatzko, p. 87.

the last line into the first line of the next chapter to save a full line. The first line of the opening chapter is arranged in this order. First stand the introductory words of the new chapter, then follows a small empty space as division-mark, and after that the short termination of the preceding chapter is printed.[100] Now, the printer of B 36 had overlooked the small division-mark in B 42 which pointed out that the words "vocatus est" belong to the previous chapter. This caused him to print the ridiculous text of B 36, Esdras IV., chap. 2 (Vol. I., fol. 342v., col. 2, line 20 sqq.): "Haec dicit dominus: Ego *vocatus* est eduxi populum istum de servitute." This oversight could take place the easier, since this third form of closing chapters in B 42 was used there for the first time, consequently the printer of B 36 was not yet familiar with it.[101]

This single passage establishes the fact that B 42 preceded B 36 and that B 36 is a reprint of B 42.[102] The slender a priori possibility is not excluded that the printer of B 36 had first found the identical arrangement of the text in a manuscript was misled, but later while printing B 42, and after having detected the error of B 36, he had consulted the manuscript and had printed the text of B 42 from this manuscript correctly, though after the third form of closing chapters, in order to save space, and accidentally met with the identical division of words as in B 36. Yet so many chance coincidences in a thing like this oversight are not very plausible.

A still more stringent proof was looked for and found.[103] The B 36 at Stuttgart has the last or fourth column of leaf No. 10 (fol. 10v., col. 2) covered with vellum. On this piece of vellum is written a text which differs entirely from the printed text below. The typesetter copying the text of B 42 had, after finishing leaf 7 of B 42, by mistake skipped the next leaf, 8, and had continued his work on leaf 9. This composition lacking the text of leaf 8 was printed. This fact settles the much debated question beyond any doubt—*the 36 line Gutenberg Bible is a reprint of the 42 line Gutenberg Bible; the B 42 is the first printed Latin Bible.* This demonstration is the more indisputable, since the possibility hitherto still existing that both Bibles were printed from an identical manuscript, noting, perhaps, different readings in the usual manner, is excluded. This oversight of the typesetter was detected soon after printing and corrected in some copies.[104]

The priority of B 42 is established now by incontestable proofs and the debate of a century's standing is closed. All bibliographers

[100] Dziatzko, p. 77.
[101] Dziatzko, p. 93.
[102] Dziatzko, p. 93.
[103] Dziatzko, p. 94.
[104] Dziatzko, pp. 94-95.

adopt the results of Dr. Dziatzko's researches. "The opinion," writes Paul Schwenke,[105] "that B 36 is earlier is now completely done away with, since K. Dziatzko has established the priority of B 42 by irrefutable arguments." And Eb. Nestle coincides with this view:[106] "After Dziatzko's final researches, not the least doubt can be entertained of B 42 being the first printed Bible." Some names of the foremost bibliographers adopting Dziatzko's conclusion may be appended here, as W. A. Copinger,[107] Leop. Delisle,[108] Otto Hartwig,[109] K. Schorbach,[110] Frank Falk,[111] Konrad Burger[112] and the authors of the "Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society."[113]

The first leaves of B 42 show some anomalies which now claim our attention. It has long been known that the different copies of B 42 do not tally. Most prominent is the peculiarity that some copies number 42 lines in each column throughout the entire work and leave empty space for *inscribing* the rubrics or superscriptions. Other copies, on the contrary, have a few rubrics printed in red color and contain some leaves with only 40 or 41 lines to a full column. These copies we mark briefly as B 40-41, whereas the designation B 42 refers to copies of the former description. There are 16 pages with 40 lines and one page with 41 lines in B 40-41. The first nine pages (Vol. I., fol. 1-5r.) of the first volume have 40 lines, and the following page (I., fol. 5v.) has 41 lines. A like variation occurs at the beginning of the Book of Kings. Dziatzko first detected that the first seven pages of the Book of Kings (Vol. I., fol. 129-132r.) are likewise printed in 40 lines. There are five rubrics printed in red—three in the first section of 40 lines and two in the latter (on fol. 129).[114]

The explanation of these deviations hinges on the solution of the question as to the priority of B 40 or B 42. H. Stevens[115] calls B 49-41 "a second issue," whereas v. d. Linde[116] defends the opposite view. This latter opinion is the only correct one. B 40 is the

[105] "Untersuchungen z. Geschichte d. ersten Buchdrucks," Berlin, 1900, p. 7.

[106] "Urtext u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel," Lips., 1897, p. 102.

[107] "Incunabula Biblica," London, 1892, pp. 1 and 8.

[108] "Les bibles de Gutenberg d'apres les recherches," de K. Dziatzko in *Journal des Savants*, Paris, 1894, pp. 401-413, reprint Paris, 1894.

[109] Festschrift, Lips & Mayence, 1900, p. 18.

[110] Festschrift, p. 208.

[111] "Bibelstudien in Mainz," Mayence, 1901, p. 142.

[112] "Printers and Publishers of the Fifteenth Century," London, 1902, p. 504.

[113] Part III., London, 1911, p. 905.

[114] Dziatzko, pp. 82, 96 sq.; Schwenke, op. cit., p. 9; Linde, III., p. 827, 869 sq.

[115] Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition, London, 1878, p. 43.

[116] Op. cit., II. cc.

first edition. In its favor speaks the circumstance that the transition to more lines to a full column marks a typographical progress. The Bible having been printed completely or partly in columns of 42 lines there was no reasonable motive for employing less lines of columns in printing some additional pages. The greater number of copies extant of B 40 add some weight to this view.[117] Most important, if not altogether decisive, is the fact that the paper copies of B 42 bear a paper-mark on the first leaves of the first volume, which is found otherwise only in parts of B 42 printed later. B 40, on the other hand, contains the same paper as the next following gatherings. B 42 makes use of the third form of transition between chapters which is unknown to the first printed sections of B 42 to B 40. Moreover, B 40-41 prints always "cu*m*que" in conformity with the bulk of B 42, whereas B 42 uses the form "cu*n*que" without exception, which is employed only in later sections of B 42.[118] The peculiarities proper to B 40-41 are evidence of yet tentative experiments, which soon gave way to complete mastery and consistency. We mention as such irregularities, which were dropped later, the use of the letter "w" in the word "e*w*angelium," the peculiarly shaped "r" after "b," the old ligature "pro," the substitution of letters for numerals, the extensive use of spelling "ci" before a vowel instead of "ti," the spelling common to the later portions of B 42, and the red print of the five rubrics. These facts cannot be explained consistently on the supposition that the entire Bible, or at least the greater part, were printed according to methods which were given up in later reprinting the few additional leaves of B 40-41. We must rather regard these peculiarities, though neither numerous nor important, as the remnants of the earliest stage of printing B 42, which were abandoned later. The comparison of the text proper leads to the same conclusion. One text is a reprint of the other. Proofs are the identical ends of columns with but four exceptions, the identical compositions of most passages and common mistakes. B 40 exhibits the earlier text, for some of its readings were printed immediately from the manuscript Bible and several mistakes were corrected in B 42. New mistakes not found in B 40 are very rare in B 42. It is highly probable, if not absolutely certain,[119] from these evidences that B 40 is the earlier edition; that this Gutenberg Bible had been planned originally as a 40 line Bible; that it was changed into a 42 line Bible ere half of the first quires of part I. and II. had been printed, and that one page (Vol. I., fol. 5v.) of 41 lines marks the transition to the final stage.[120] The numerous contractions of the 40 line pages made it

[117] Dziatzko, p. 98; Linde, III., p. 827.
[118] Dziatzko, pp. 49-50, 98-99; Schwenke, p. 9.
[119] Schwenke, op. cit., p. 9, regards it as a demonstration.
[120] Dziatzko, pp. 100-102; Schwenke, p. 9; Linde, III., 827.

easy to fill the larger printing surface of B 42 with the same text; the contractions were replaced by more or less unabridged words.[121] The second edition of the 40 line pages coincides with the latest sections printed. It was finished, though, some time before the entire B 42 was completed. This is what the water-marks disclose to us.[122] Gutenberg saved about 32 leaves by raising the lines from 40 to 42.[123]

These are not the only instances of leaves set up in type twice so as to form practically two editions; of one leaf (fol. 134) at least three varieties occur. Paul Schwenke,[124] carrying forward the results obtained by K. Dziatzko and other scholars, has shown that the B 42 was printed in ten sections on six presses. When the three first presses had respectively printed fol. 1-32r., fol. 129-158r. and 325-340 (Vol. II., fol. 1-16) and a fourth and fifth had printed fol. 486 (Vol. 2, fol. 162r.) and fol. 261r., it was resolved to increase the size of the edition by about one-third,[125] and these pages had subsequently to be set up afresh, so that additional copies of them might be printed[126] to complete these missing parts of the entire Bible. These leaves were printed concurrently with the reissue of the 40 line leaves shortly before the termination of the entire work.[127] Twelve of the 36 copies of B 42 extant belong to the second issue and 24 copies to the first issue.[128]

Apart from the second issue of these parts, reprints of isolated pages occur in the remainder of the work. Only one page was printed at a time and alterations in the spelling and the contractions were made during the course of printing. It happened at times that sheets were spoiled on the third or fourth page. Since the types of the composition of the first pages were distributed already, a reprint of those pages was necessitated in order to replace the spoiled copies. Instances of such isolated reprints and alterations during the printing are Vol. I., fol. 34r., 52r.; Vol. II., 22r. Probably no two copies of any fifteenth century book exactly resemble each other on every page throughout the volume. These different reprints in B 42 are of the highest importance, because they transmit the same text set up at the beginning and at the termination or within short lapses of the printing of B 42, giving evidence of the gradual evolution of the technique in printing B 42.[129]

---

121 Linde III., p. 870.
122 Dziatzko, pp. 41, 48, 50; Schwenke, p. 10.
123 Schwenke, p. 32.
124 Op. cit., pp. 9-17, 51-55.
125 Dziatzko, pp. 50, 102.
126 Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles, Part III., p. 906.
127 Dziatzko, p. 102; Schwenke, p. 10.
128 Dziatzko, p. 50; Schwenke, pp. 16-17.
129 Schwenke, p. 15; Historical Catalogue, p. 906.

The B 42 is divided, as stated above, into ten sections, which were printed independently of each other; these begin at fol. 1, 102, 129, 261, 325, 455, 486, 586, 609 and 634, respectively. The first printer had completed two leaves, fol. 1-2, when the second printer commenced printing fol. 129. After printing four more leaves, respectively, a third printer started in at fol. 325. All three printers had advanced about 18 leaves farther in their different sections when a fourth printer began work at fol. 486. About 18 more leaves having been struck off by those four printers, two more printers joined in the work at fol. 102 and 261, respectively. These six printers worked simultaneously till the work was finished. The first printer, after having worked up to fol. 101, commenced printing fol. 609 to 633. The second printer, having completed fol. 260, undertook the work of printing the second issue of several parts mentioned before. The third printer terminated his work at fol. 454, as did the fourth printer at fol. 585, but the latter finished some leaves of the reprints later on. The fifth printer, after finishing fol. 128, went over to fol. 455, worked up to fol. 485, printed fols. 634 to the last page, 641, and helped finally to bring out the second issue of some parts. The sixth printer, having carried through his work to fol. 324, concluded his typographical labor by printing fol. 586 to fol. 608. These are the happy results of P. Schwenke's scholarly researches,[130] which go beyond Dziatzko's conclusions.[131]

B 42 contains 641 printed leaves in folio, put together as a rule into quinions or gatherings of five sheets, ten leaves, twenty pages. The whole is made up by 60 quinion (=600 leaves), on sexternio (=12 leaves), two ternions (=12 leaves), 2 binions (=8 leaves)[132] and nine single leaves inserted at various places (fols. 99, 126, 246, 259, 485, 605, 632, 634 and 635). Some copies contain an additional binio (=4 leaves), which is printed. It gives an index of the rubrics which serves as a direction for the illuminator and rubricator. This "tabula rubricarum" was not printed for all copies. Another supplement to a few copies were two or three leaves printed with the text of the ten "Cantica ad matutinas" and the "Te Deum." Only one single leaf of these is preserved now at the National Library at Paris. Some copies contain a few empty leaves. The whole work, like most of the early editions of the Bible, is generally divided into two volumes, the second beginning on fol. 325 with the preface to the books of Solomon and numbering 317 leaves.[133]

[130] Schwenke, op. cit., pp. 51-55; on pages 52-53 a graphic table of the work of the individual printers is given.

[131] Dziatzko, pp. 25-48.

[132] Linde, III., p. 869, is mistaken speaking of 66 quires; there are 65 quires and 9 single leaves, as Dziatzko proved.

[133] Dziatzko, pp. 25-29; Linde, III., pp. 867, 869. The collation given by W. A. Copinger, Incunabula Biblica, p. 2 sq., is antiquated since Dziatzko's researches.

Four different kinds of paper were used for B 42, distinguished by different water-marks. A copy of the first edition not containing any reprints is made up of 234 sheets of paper with the water-mark of a bull's head with a star, 52 sheets with the water-mark of an oblong bunch of grapes on a stem with a loop, 16 sheets with the water-mark of a bunch of grapes in a compressed form on a shorter stem and 19 sheets with the water-mark of a running bull.[134] The grouping of those four kinds of sheets into the 65 quires was instrumental in tracing the work of six printers, as stated above.[135]

The B 42 is printed in double columns. The space between them is not the same everywhere; it varies from 20-24mm.-0.7874 to 0.945 inch.[136] Apart from the 40 and 41 lines in some copies, mentioned above, it is printed with 42 lines to a full column except fol. 310, which has 41 lines. This single exception was first noticed by Schwenke. It is the effect of an oversight, as is seen from the too-much spaced text. To all appearance a part of the text was composed twice by a mistake. This mishap was set aright on the same surface. One line of the column was dropped without trying to regain the height of the surrounding columns by means of space lines.[137] The verses of fols. 246, 260, 513, 597 and 632 (sometimes fol. 633) are blank. The verse of fol. 324 is blank for a great part. The verse of fols. 101, 192 and 238 has several lines blank in the second column at the end.[138] The remainder of the surface is covered with print.

The first Gutenberg Bible is without title-page, numerals or foliation, pagination, without signatures, catchwords or running titles. The titles to every book and chapter and to each Psalm and the large initial letttrs are rubricated by hand, with the exception of the five rubrics printed in red in B 40-41. The red headings were printed later than the B 40-41 in black. This process had been perhaps too difficult and wearisome and was given up after the first two quires had been finished.[139] Some written substitute for the later printed numerals must have existed already. In the Pelplin copy of B 42 the first five leaves of every quire are signed by hand, with the numbers 1-5 on the right corner at the foot of the recto. These written numerals were cut off partly by the bookbinder. Since it is highly probable that these signatures cannot be attributed to the later rubricator, we must assume that every sheet was numbered beforehand to avert a mixing up of the singly printed

[134] Dziatzko, pp. 41-47; Schwenke, pp. 51, 56; fac simile of the four water-marks in Dziatzko, op. cit., table III.

[135] Dziatzko, p. 46 sq.; Schwenke, pp. 51, 54.

[136] Schwenke, p. 46; Copinger, op. cit., p. 2, gives "⅞ of an inch."

[137] Schwenke, p. 30.

[138] Dziatzko, pp. 25-27, 84.

[139] Dziatzko, p. 82 sq., 115; Schwenke, p. 50 sq.

pages. These numerals were placed to all appearance purposely so near the margin that the bookbinder should cut them away. This numeration of the sheets of each quire by hand can still be seen in some other copies of B 42, where the right-hand margin was not curtailed too much. The Berlin B 42 on vellum contains two *written* catchwords on the verso of fols. 99 and 124 at the bottom, which seem to have been placed there during the course of printing.[140]

The first issue, B 40-41, begins in red fol. 1, recto, col. 1, with the three line heading, "Incipit epistola . . ." The second issue, B 42, leaves three lines blank for the rubricator. On line 4 both issues commence printing St. Jerome's letter, prefixed to the Bible, beginning "Frater Ambrosius." Genesis begins fol. 5, recto col. 1. In B 40 the heading "Incipit liber . . ." is in red print on fol. 5, whereas B 42 has a blank line. The three other rubrics in red print occur on fol. 4r., col. 2, fol. 129r., col. 1 and fol. 129v., col. 2. The first volume contains fol. 5-324, the books of the Old Testament as far as the Psalms. The second volume, fol. 325-641, contains fol. 325-513, the remaining books of the Old Testament, and fol. 514-641 the books of the New Testament.[141]

The blank space left for the headings is not equally apportioned in B 42. As a rule one or two lines were left over; at times the remainder of a line had to suffice. Three blank lines are a rare occurrence.[142]

Paul Schwenke conjectures that the total number of paper copies of B 42 printed may have been about 160 to 170. This size of the paper edition is very credible compared with the thirty copies still extant. One copy saved out of every five or six is a very fair proportion considering the enormous waste of European libraries. The vellum copies may have been as many as thirty or more, taking the extant copies as a base of reckoning. The entire edition comprised 200 copies at the highest, of which one-fifth is still preserved.[143]

The time consumed in printing B 42 can be figured out approximately. From the survey given before of the work of the six printers we know that none of the six presses had to issue more than 300 pages each, and they all executed their work within about the same time. Now it is not plausible that a printer could have finished a page in a day, counting typesetting, printing of 200 copies and distrbuting the types. Two days' time seems to be too great

---

140 Schwenke, p. 60.

141 Dziatzko, p. 82; Copinger, op. cit., p. 2 sq.

142 Dziatzko, p. 83 sq.

143 Schwenke, p. 56 sq.

an allowance. At any rate, we cannot compute more than two years' time for printing 300 pages.[144]

Scholars are divided as to the date of printing B 42. Schwenke in 1900[145] fixed upon the latter half of the year 1453 as the date of the beginning and upon about the middle of 1455 as the time of the termination. W. A. Copinger[146] and K. Dziatzko[147] assigned it to the years 1450-1455, A. v. d. Linde[148] to about 1453-1456, "Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles" in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society[149] to 1452-1456, Gottfr. Reichhart, O. S. B.,[150] to 1452-1455. Recently Schwenke[151] sets as the date the period from 1450-1453. His date appears to be the only correct one, as we will see later. At all eevnts, it could not have been begun before the spring of 1450, when Gutenberg entered into partnership with Faust, and it could not have been finished later than August, 1456, the rubricated date of the Paris copy.[152]

Regarding the expenses for printing B 42, we have no definite information. Nevertheless, we can arrive at an approximate idea of the cost of the work. We know that Gutenberg borrowed 800 florins from John Faust, of Mayence, toward the beginning of 1450. He used the money in establishing a printing office.[153] That this loan, a high sum in those days, sufficed for Gutenberg's purpose we know from a later instance. The Abbot Stamhaim established a printing office in his monastery of St. Ulrich and Afra at Augsbourg. It took him a whole year to procure the necessary outfit. He bought five presses for the sum of 73 florins, had five smaller presses made and types cast, and commenced printing in 1473 the "Speculum" of Vincent of Beauvais. The whole outlay amounted to 703 florins.[154] But 800 florins did not cover the working expenses of Gutenberg; he therefore took up a second loan of 800 florins, probably two years later. These 1,600 florins were never paid in full to Gutenberg.[155] Moreover, we do not know how much of his own money Gutenberg had added. Finally, we have evidence of the fact that Gutenberg had used some money for buying paper and printing a part of another book. Considering these things, we come very near the truth by stating that the entire cost for putting up the first

144 Schwenke, p. 57.
145 Op. cit., pp. 57-59.
146 Incunabula Biblica, London, 1892, p. 1.
147 Op. cit., p. 114.
148 Gesch. d. Erfind. d. Buchdr., III., Berlin, 1886, pp. 867, 880.
149 London, 1911, p. 905.
150 Beitraege z. Incunabelnkunde, Lips., 1895, p. 279.
151 Zweiundvierzigzeilige Bibel, Lips., 1913.
152 Copinger, p. 1; Dziatzko, p. 118.
153 Schorbach in: Festschrift, p. 205 sq.
154 Linde, III., pp. 809-810.
155 Schorbach, op. cit., p. 209; Linde, III., p. 852.

printing office of a larger size and issuing the first large book, the B 42, amounted all in all to about 1,500 florins, more or less. About half of this sum may have been the actual expense for printing, buying paper and vellum, paying wages and house rent, furnishing ink and the like.[156] The Abbot John Trithemius relates in 1513 that 4,000 florins had been expended by Gutenberg before finishing the third quire. But his description of an impossible technique of printing and his otherwise evidently wrong statements evince the fact that Trithemius presented the reveries of his mind as sound history in his account of the invention of printing embodied in his "Annals of Hirschau."[157]

At least forty copies of B 42 are known to be still in existence. In 1886 v. d. Linde compiled a list comprising twenty-nine or thirty copies.[158] W. A. Copinger[159] in 1892 could point out from thirty-three to thirty-five copies. Paul Schwenke raised this number to at least forty copies.[160] Unfortunately not all of them are complete. Twelve copies on vellum are known to exist, one of them containing Vol. I. only and one containing the New Testament only.[161] Two of these copies are at present in the United States—one in the library of the late Mr. J. Pierrepont Morgan, of New York, and the other in that of the library of Mr. Henry E. Huntington, of Los Angeles. Other copies are preserved at Leipsic (two copies), Berlin, Goettingen and Fulda (only Vol. I.), at the Benedictine monastery of St. Paul in Carinthia (Austria), at Paris, London and Rome. Twenty-seven copies on paper are known for certain to exist, three of them lacking Vol. II. (the copies at St. Omer, Copenhagen, and London, Lambeth Palace Library) and one lacking only the New Testament (the *paper* copy in J. Pierrepont Morgan's library). The remainder of these copies are complete, though some lack single leaves. There are seven copies formerly extant which have not been found as yet and which cannot be identified with the copies now known. Two or three of them must still be hidden away somewhere. Moreover, the Treves copy is a combination of the first copy of the first volume with the second volume of another copy and must be regarded as two incomplete copies. These copies added to the thirty-nine or (the Treves copy put down as two) to the forty known we have knowledge of forty-two to forty-three cop-

156 Linde, III., 852, n. 11.; Schorbach, op. cit., p. 206.

157 Linde, I., pp. 56-59; Schwenke, p. 60.

158 Op. cit., pp. 871-879; Linde, I., p. 82, writes that "there are not twenty copies extant."

159 Incunabula Biblica, pp. 4-6.

160 Op. cit., pp. 2-9.

161 Hist. Catal. of Printed Bibles in the Library of the Brit. Bible Soc., Part III., p. 906. Schwenke l. c. knows of only eleven; Linde, l. c. of nine, Copinger l. c. of only seven copies on vellum.

ies of B 42. Schwenke was able to find out where thirty-seven copies are preserved. Arranged according to the different countries, eleven copies are preserved in Germany (the Treves copy counted as one), ten in England, seven in the United States, four in France, two in Austria, one in Italy, one in Russia and one in Denmark. The grouping according to places brings New York in front with five copies (two in Mr. J. Pierrepont Morgan's library, one each in the New York Public Library, New York General Theological Seminary and in Mr. James W. Ellsworth's library), then follow London with four, Paris and Leipsic with each three copies. The remainder is divided among places possessing but one copy. There are two such places in the United States—Los Angeles and Harvard. At the former city the first Hoe Bible on vellum is preserved and at the latter the second Hoe Bible on paper, both sold in 1911. Schwenke[162] believes that in spite of his extensive researches one or the other church library may enshrine yet a hitherto unknown copy. No copy exists at Mayence, Hanover[163] and Nantes and the one of the Duke of Devonshire is doubtful.[164] Bibliographers never drew up a list of the different fragments of B 42 extant. Thus f. i. three leaves on vellum are preserved at Dresden, one leaf in the University Library, Cambridge, England,[165] several leaves in the Kestner Museum at Hanover.[166] Linde[167] is of the opinion that it is neither possible nor desirable to give a catalogue of these fragments. But this is overdoing a good thing. Such a list would surely reveal the existence of some additional copies of B 42.

The value of these early Bibles has gone up remarkably in late years and must be necessarily on the increase if we consider the exceptional demand of public and private libraries in all parts of the world, especially in England and in this country, to possess some early printed Bible. No doubt often the difference in the price realized at sales by the same edition of some of the earlier Bibles is owing to their respective conditions and occasionally to the illuminator's talent or the binder's reputation and skill, but this is not always the reason. In the following I give many illustrations of the remarkable rise in price of these early Bibles, as such details may prove of interest. The first copy of B 42 which was ever sold is the copy on vellum now in the British Museum. It was sold at Gaignat's sale in 1769 for 2,100 francs and passed later to Count MacCarthy, at whose sale in 1817 it sold for 6,260 france.[168] The

[162] Op. cit., p. 9.
[163] As Copinger states erroneously, n. 18 and n. 22.
[164] Schwenke, p. 9.
[165] Copinger, p. 4; Linde, III., p. 871.
[166] Hist. Jahrb., XXXII. (Munich, 1911), p. 946.
[167] Op. cit., p. 871.
[168] Copinger, op. cit., Parts V.-VI. and p. 4; Linde, III., p. 876.

two copies of Cardinal Loménie de Brienne were disposed of at a public auction in Paris in 1792 for 2,500 francs (exactly 2,499) each.[169] The copy in the Bodleian Library at Oxford was bought in 1793 for £100.[170] D'Ourches' copy on paper sold in 1811 for 1,900 francs. A copy was withdrawn in Didot's sale (Paris, 1810) at 1,000 francs.[171] The copy in the Larcher collection was sold in 1814. for 2,121 francs.[172] Dibdin in 1825 valued a copy at 150 guineas only. But modern times witnessed extravagant prices. The first copy to cross the Atlantic, now in the New York Public Library, was first sold in 1829 for £215. It was bought by Lenox in 1847 for £500.[173] The most phenomenal rise in the price is that of the copy in possession of Mr. H. E. Huntington, of Los Angeles. It sold in 1825 to Perkins for £504, and at his sale in 1873 sold to Lord Ashburnham for £3,400.[174] At the latter's sale in 1897 it was purchased for the American bibliophile, Robert Hoe, of New York, for $20,000 and passed to its present owner in 1911 for the sum of $50,000, the highest price ever paid for a printed book. The Sykes copy was sold for 190 guineas in 1824, advanced to £2,690 when again offered in the Perkins dispersal in 1873[175] and rose to $29,000 when auctioned off in 1911 at the Huth sale, passing to the well-known London bookdealer, Bernard Quaritch. In 1884 the Syston Park copy of Sir John Thorold brought £3,900, but experienced a "drop" when it again came up for sale in the Rev. William Makellar library in 1898,[176] then bringing £2,950 and passing to the New York General Theological Seminary. The copy had in 1884 the distinction of being the highest priced book not printed on vellum.[177] This record is apparently held now by the Huth copy, sold for $29,000. Next to it follows the second Hoe copy on paper, which was secured at the Hoe library auction, January 9, 1912, for the sum of $27,500. It was purchased by H. E. Widener, of Philadelphia, and was given to Harvard. Lord Gosford's copy of the first volume only brought £500 in 1884,[178] but advanced to £2,050 when resold in the Amherst of Hackney sale in 1908. The James W. Ellsworth copy, of New York, was first sold in 1870 to Mr. Brayton Ives, of New York, for $15,000. In 1891 it passed to its present owner for the sum of $14,800.[179] A paper copy was bought in 1822 by the

169 Schwenke, pp. 5, 8; Linde, III., p. 876; Copinger, p. 5.
170 Copinger, p. 4; Schwenke, p. 5.
171 Copinger, p. 6; Schwenke, p. 8; Linde, III., p. 879.
172 Copinger, p. 5; Schwenke, p. 8; Linde, III., p. 879.
173 Copinger, p. 5.
174 Copinger, p. 4; Schwenke, p. 6 sq.
175 Copinger, p. 5; Schwenke, p. 5.
176 Copinger, p. 5; Linde, III., p. 877.
177 Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles in the Libr. of the Brit. and F. Bible Soc., P. III., p. 906.
178 Copinger, p. 6.
179 Copinger, p. 5; Schwenke, p. 6.

Duke of Sussex for 160 guineas, and at his sale in 1844 sold for £190, whence it passed to Daly, Bishop of Cashel, at whose sale in 1858 it sold to Quaritch for £595. It then passed to Lord Crawford and was bought again by Quaritch at his sale in 1887 for £2,650.[180] Quaritch bought in 1889 Lord Hopetoun's copy for £2,000. He has disposed since of these two copies.[181]

It is clear from these big figures that the 42 line Bible of Gutenberg can never be other than the wealthy collector's "fancy." It is no less equally clear that a carefully produced facsimile reprint will be of the greatest value to the students, considering that a perfect facsimile is for most purposes as good as the original. But whilst the original is far beyond the means of most people, a facsimile reissue of the original will not be beyond the means of many educated persons. Twenty-eight years ago the English publisher, Mr. Alfred Brothers, of Manchester, announced his intention of publishing a facsimile reprint of the 42 line Bible. Lord Crawford had promised to lend his copy for reproduction, but the enterprise came to nothing. In March, 1910, the Paris bookseller and publisher, Hubert Welter, came out with the same project. He issued a prospectus in French and German, inviting subscriptions, the first eight of which came from Germany and Austria. Three months had scarcely elapsed before a rival facsimile edition of the same book was announced by a Leipsic firm, the Insel-Verlag. An agreement was reached later between the two rival firms, according to which Hubert Welter withdrew his project, leaving his competitor the sole publisher of the *first facsimile reprint* ever issued. The work is published in two volumes of about 1,300 pages in folio and a third supplementary volume giving the history of the original. There are two editions to be had. The one on paper is issued in 300 volumes, costing 700 marks (about $175) for unbound copies and 850 marks (about $212.50) for copies bound in pigskin with boards of wood and clasps. The edition on vellum is issued in no more than twenty copies at the price of 300 marks (about $750). The publication was completed in 1913. This reproduction resembles the original entirely in type, composition, orthography, paper and even the water-marks. The facsimile reprint will be a desirable possession. May it justify its publisher's anticipation[182] and help to spread the interest in the first printed Bible.

[180] Copinger, p. 5; Schwenke, p. 5 sq. L. Delisle estimated the value of the vellum copy in the National Library, Paris, at 120,000 francs, the paper copy at more than 150,000 francs. (*Journal des Savants*, April, 1893, p. 216.)

[181] Copinger, p. 4 sq.; Schwenke, p. 7. In the above the figures are taken from various periodicals, when no sources are quoted.

[182] Specimen pages and prospectuses of this fac simile edition may be had through any larger bookseller's firm.

B 42 is a masterpiece and, despite the infancy of printing, a marvelous production.[183] It is astonishing that this first larger book printed turned out to be a veritable chef d'œuvre.[184] Copies of the Gutenberg Bible are substantial, like so many contemporary pieces of art that have come down to us. The strength and beauty of the paper, the lustre of the ink and the general beauty and magnificence of the volumes are justly praised.[185] These relics of a bygone age are esteemed highly and guarded carefully as the most precious treasures of our public libraries,[186] and the single copies are bought for what Gutenberg would have considered a fortune and which would have enabled him to issue several editions of hundreds of copies.

J. M. Lenhart, O. M., Cap.

Wheeling, W. Va.

THE TEXT OF THE ADESTE FIDELES.

ALTHOUGH much light has been thrown in recent years on the history of this hymn, Catholic hymnals still give variant ascriptions of both the text and the tune. Among the few writers who have professedly treated of its history, some have indulged in assumptions which do not appear to be justified by the facts so far as they are known, or have hastily taken things for granted, or have allowed a personal predilection to color their surmises. It may therefore be of interest to record here what is at present known concerning the hymn and to consider some of the variant conjectures and assertions.

I. VARIANT ASCRIPTIONS OF AUTHORSHIP.

1. A writer in the "Pall Mall Gazette" (26 December, 1900) declares that the words are "believed to date from the persecution under Diocletian." All that need be said just now is that this belief is a most curious one.

2. A Catholic hymnal issued as late as the year 1912 (The Oregon Catholic Hymnal: Portland and New York) still follows the unsupported view of several hymnologists in ascribing the text to St. Bonaventure (d. 1274). The text is not found in the works of the saint.

3. Several Catholic hymnals award the words to a Cistercian source. Thus the De La Salle Hymnal (New York, 1913) refers

183 Copinger, p. 1.

184 Schwenke, p. 18.

185 J. Townley. Introd. to the Lit. Hist. of the Bible, 2d edit., London, 1828, p. 234, speaking of the John Rylands Library copy.

186 Fr. Falk. Bibelstudien, Mayence, 1901, p. 143.

vaguely to a "Cistercian Gradual." Father Gaynor, in his St. Patrick's Hymn Book (Dublin, 1906), limits the vagueness somewhat in his ascription to a "Cistercian Sequence, XV. Century." Nearly a quarter of a century earlier Orby Shipley noted the hymn in his "Annus Sanctus" (London, 1884) as a "Sequence from the Cistercian Gradual of the Fifteenth-Sixteenth Century."

Against this view of a Cistercian origin, and *a fortiori* against the particularizing with respect to the century as "Fifteenth" or "Fifteenth-Sixteenth" century, several important considerations militate.

First of all, the words have not been traced further back than to the middle of the eighteenth century, where they occur in various manuscripts:

(a) MS. in Euing Library, Glasgow, Scotland, referred to by Dom Ould, O. S. B., in his Book of Hymns with Tunes (London, 1913) as the source of the four stanzas which I shall call the "English Cento" (that is, stanzas 1, 2, 7, 8 of the complete Latin text as given by Dom Ould). The MS. bears the inscription: Joannes Franciscus Wade scripsit 1750.

(b) MS. at Stonyhurst College, Lancashire, England, referred to by Cowan and Love in their Music of the Church Hymnary (Edinburgh, 1901), also written by Father Wade, and dated 1751 ("Joannes Franciscus Wade, scriptor. Anno Domini MDCCLI"). The MS. gives the "English Cento."

(c) MS. in the Henry Watson Library, Manchester, England, referred to by the editor of the Historical Edition of H. A. & M. (London, 1909), who thinks it may be of "possibly a little earlier date" than the Stonyhurst MS. The words are, presumably, again the English Cento, as otherwise the editor would doubtless have indicated the opposite fact.

(d) MS. in Clongowes Wood College, Sallins, County Kildare, Ireland, referred to by Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood in "The Dolphin" (Vol. VIII., 1905, p. 709), which "has merely the tune," according to Dr. Flood, but to which Dom Ould refers as the source of the words (equally with the Glasgow MS.) of stanzas 1, 2, 7, 8—again the English Cento. Dr. Flood writes, *loc. cit.:* "The oldest existing manuscript of the melody so far discovered is in a volume of Masses and motets formerly belonging to Father Peter Kenny, S. J., the founder of Clongowes Wood College . . . containing autograph musical scores of various dates between the years 1740 and 1749. . . . I frequently examined this old folio during the years that I was master at Clongowes Wood College, some twenty years ago." It may therefore be quite likely that the recollection of Dr. Flood may be incorrect with respect to the absence of the words

in this MS., as, in 1913, Dom Ould expressly refers to this MS. for the Latin words of what I have styled the "English Cento," in contradistinction to four other stanzas of Latin words used commonly in France, and therefore styled by me the "French Cento" (in the following part of this paper). With respect to the date of 1745 assigned by Dr. Flood ("The Dolphin," loc. cit., p. 710) to the melody of the Adeste Fideles in this MS., I shall have something to say further on.

(e) MS. in St. Edmund's College, Ware, England, containing words and music, and dated 1760. Dr. Flood says that it "does not materially differ from the Stonyhurst MS."; and Mr. James Britten, reviewing the Anglican hymnbook ("The English Hymnal," London, 1906) in "The Month" (September, 1906, p. 280), thinks that the hymn is "doubtless in other similar collections by Wade." Mr. Britten had examined this MS. "some years" before writing his review in "The Month," and mentions its inclusion of a familiar tune of the Tantum Ergo wrongly ascribed to Webbe.

So much for the testimony of the oldest known MSS., which leads us to date the hymn about the middle of the eighteenth century. Another interesting corroboration of this is furnished by the editors of the "Music of the Church Hymnary" (p. 7): "The words of the hymn . . . appear in an edition, published in 1760, of 'The Evening Office of the Church.' The hymn is there introduced thus: 'From the Nativity of Our Lord to the Purification, exclusive; whilst the Benediction is giving, is sung Adeste Fideles, etc.' In previous editions of this book, published in 1710, 1725 and 1748, the hymn does not appear." Let me add that in the edition of 1760 of this volume (entitled "The Evening Office of the Church in Latin and English," London, 1760) the stanzas are 1, 2, 7, 8, as in the MSS. already noted, and that the English translation begins: "Draw near, ye faithful Christians" (the earliest known translation of the Adeste Fideles into English).

No MSS. or printed books on the Continent antedate the English MSS. and prints. And one may therefore confidently reject the ascription to a Cistercian source of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. We have the further confirmation of this view in the declaration of Dr. Flood (loc. cit.) that he had "examined the Cistercian Gradual of various dates within the sixteenth century, and nothing approaching a modernly constructed tune, such as is the Adeste Fideles, is to be found therein. An esteemed member of the Cistercian community at Mount Melleray corroborates this statement. . . ." It is doubtless fair to presume that the words were not found, either, although Dr. Flood does not expressly state this fact in this connection.

4. It is proper to notice here another conjecture, namely, that the hymn "cannot be traced farther back than 1720" (Dr. Flood, loc. cit., p. 707). Why this particularity of date of the farthest backward limit is given is not insinuated anywhere by Dr. Flood. The tune has not been traced farther back than the year 1750—or, according to Dr. Flood himself (loc. cit., p. 710), to 1745. How long the hymn may have existed is open to any conjecture based on its character and the MSS. testimony.

The manuscript testimony goes back, as I have said, only to the year 1750 (MS. in Euing Library, Glasgow). When, therefore, Dr. Flood, in his article in "The Dolphin" (p. 707), declares that "both words and music cannot be traced farther back than 1720," he may be speaking *in sensu diviso;* for afterwards in the same article (p. 709) he refers to the Clongowes Wood College as containing the "oldest existing manuscript of the melody so far discovered." In order to harmonize these two statements we must suppose that Dr. Flood refers to the year 1720 as the earliest date to which the *text* of the hymn can be traced, while the earliest known manuscript of the *tune* is in the Clongowes Wood College volume. The musical autographs in this volume run, he says, from the year 1740 to 1749, and he dates the manuscript of the Adeste Fideles as 1745: "The air is to be met with in 1745" (p. 710).

Now I venture to express a suspicion of this positive and unqualified dating for several reasons. It is a round date and is probably a rough guess, for it would be an obvious midway-post between the years 1740 and 1749. I further doubt the date of 1745, because Dr. Flood nowhere mentions in what part of the volume this particular manuscript of the tune of the Adeste Fideles occurs—whether in the middle or towards or at the end of the volume—and does not inform his readers whether or not this particular musical autograph is dated. Again, I have already pointed out that Dom Ould, O. S. B., refers to this very manuscript (which Dr. Flood says has merely the tune) as the source of the words (of the English Cento) which Dom Ould gives in his "Book of Hymns with Tunes." The declarations of Dr. Flood and Dom Ould are directly at variance. Dr. Flood appears to depend on his memory for his description of the manuscript (he says that he had frequently examined it when he was master at Clongowes Wood College "some twenty years ago") —and it may be that his memory has played him false.

But it may also be that his memory is mistaken, or that some notes he may have made at the time could not be read clearly twenty years after, when he attempted to place the datings of the manuscript-volume as running from 1740 to 1749, and ascribed the particular manuscript of the Adeste Fideles to the year 1745.

The confusion is not lessened by a further casual contribution to the history of the hymn which Dr. Flood made in "The Ecclesiastical Review" for May, 1914, when he was reviewing the earliest "Oratory Hymnbook." Hymn No. 47 of this volume is Canon Oakeley's version into English of the Adeste Fideles, and, when discussing it, Dr. Flood declares that "the tune goes back to the year 1740."

We have therefore three rather conflicting statements emanating from the same source. In "The Dolphin" (loc. cit., p. 707) Dr. Flood says: "Both words and music cannot be traced farther back than 1720." In the same article (p. 709) he declares that the manuscript-volume in Clongowes Wood College contains "the oldest existing manuscript of the melody so far discovered," and that this manuscript "has merely the tune," while the Stonyhurst manuscript "has words and music." Further on (loc. cit., p. 710) he says that the air of the Adeste Fideles "is to be met with in 1745." Finally, in the "Ecclesiastical Review" (loc. cit., p. 538) he says that "the tune goes back to the year 1740." 1720, 1745 and 1740. "Devine si tu peux, et choisis si tu l'oses!"

For this reason I have ventured to date the earliest manuscript testimony, so far as is known at present, as belonging to the year 1750 (the MS. in Euing Library, Glasgow), and feel compelled to disregard the claims made for priority of the Clongowes Wood College volume by Dr. Flood, whose memory may easily be at fault in the matter, and whose statements are certainly conflicting.

5. Somewhat similar to the preceding conjecture is that of Mr. Brooke in Julian's "Dictionary of Hymnology": "Most probably it is a hymn of the seventeenth or eighteenth century, and of French or German authorship." And the editor of the Historical Edition of H. A. and M. says: "The Hymn is properly a Prose for Christmas Day, and belongs probably to the Latin hymnody of the French Church in the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. But, strangely enough, it has so far been traced further back in English than in French use."

With respect to the view that the hymn may be of German origin, as Mr. Brooke suggests, it may be said, simply, that it is not in Daniel's "Thesaurus," that it is not a favorite of German hymnals, that in some—even recent ones—in America (where its vogue in English hymnals would suggest its inclusion in German ones), it is not found at all, and that we might fairly conclude that its use is not traditional with Germans in any such fashion as the "English Cento" or "French Cento" is popular in England and in France. For instance, it is not found in Hellebusch's "Katholisches Gesang-Buch" (Cincinnati, 1858), which nevertheless has fourteen Christmas hymns; nor in Hellebusch's "Vollstaendige Gesang-Schule,"

which contains a number of songs, including an Advent Prayer and a Christmas Song (Cincinnati, 1859); nor is it found even in the "Cantemus Domino" (a hymnal with both English and Latin texts), edited by Father Ludwig Bonvin, S. J. (St. Louis, 1912); nor in the German section (comprising twenty-seven Christmas hymns) of "Katholisches Gesangbuch" (Philadelphia, 1907), although the text of the French Cento is given in the section devoted to Latin hymns; nor is either Latin or English text given in Singenberger's "Cantate" (Pustet, New York, 1912). It is thus curious to find some German editors ignoring it even in their hymnals for English-speaking congregations, despite its immense popularity with English-speaking congregations.

The hymn, however, is very popular in France as well as in England and in America. Is it, then, probably of French origin? Before attempting an answer to this question it will be desirable to consider the French use of the hymn.

II. THE ENGLISH AND FRENCH CENTOS.

The complete Latin text, in eight stanzas, is given in "Thesaurus Animae Christianae" (Mechlin, undated) and in Ould's "Book of Hymns with Tunes" (London, 1913). What I have styled the English Cento comprises the four stanzas commencing with the words *Adeste fideles, Deum de Deo, Cantet nunc Io* and *Ergo qui natus,* respectively. This is the cento found in the manuscripts I have cited, in the earliest printed books, and in wonderfully unvarying fashion in English Catholic hymnals down to the most recent years. It may be fairly styled the English Cento. In the complete form of the hymn these four stanzas would be numbered 1, 2, 7 and 8. The French form of the hymn begins with the first stanza unaltered (i. e., the stanza commencing with *Adeste fideles*) and adds (or interpolates) the following:

3. En grege relicto
Humiles ad cunas,
Vocati pastores approperant.
Et nos ovanti
Gradu festinemus.
Venite adoremus Dominum.

4. Stella duce, Magi
Christum adorantes,
Aurum, thus et myrrham dant munera.
Jesu infanti
Corda praebeamus:
Venite adoremus Dominum.

5. Aeterni Parentis
Splendorem aeternum
Velatum sub carne videbimus.
Deum infantem,
Pannis involutum.
Venite adoremus Dominum.

6. Pro nobis egenum
Et foeno cubantem
Piis foveamus amplexibus:
Sic nos amantem
Quis non redamaret?
Venite adoremus Dominum.

There is a striking differentiation—which I have nowhere seen commented upon—between the English and French centos. In the English cento no two stanzas are alike in syllabication, while all the stanzas in the French cento are identical in the numeration of syllables in the respective lines. This fact should naturally lead to speculation and to various hypotheses in respect of the authorship and history of the hymn. The numerical type should, of course, be found in the first stanza. We find there:

6 = Adeste, fideles,
6 = Laeti triumphantes,
10 = Venite, venite in Bethlehem:
5 = Natum videte
6 = Regem angelorum,
10 = Venite adoremus Dominum.

All the stanzas of the French cento follow this scheme of numeration with absolute exactness, as the reader may find by actual count in the stanzas printed above in the present article. But none of the stanzas in the English cento agrees with this typical scheme, nor do any two stanzas agree. Let us take the second stanza:

5 = Deum de Deo,
6 = Lumen de Lumine,
8 = Gestant puellae viscera:
4 = Deum verum,
6 = Genitum non factum.
10 = Venite adoremus Dominum.

There is no order here, no balance of verse, no symmetry in the two halves of the stanza. So with the third stanza:

5 = Cantet nunc Io
6 = Chorus angelorum,
9 = Cantet nunc aula caelestium:
8 = Gloria
6 = In excelsis Deo.
10 = Venite adoremus Dominum.

Finally, we have the last stanza, disagreeing with the first and the other two stanzas:

5 = Ergo qui natus
6 = Die hodierna,
8 = Jesu, tibi sit gloria;
5 = Patris aeterni
6 = Verbum caro factum,
10 = Venite adoremus Dominum.

If the thought of the author of the Adeste Fideles was to construct for Christmastide a sequence which should imitate that of Eastertide, he would naturally imitate also the striking features of the Eastertide sequence, namely, irregularity of numeration in the succeeding lines combined with regularity in the form of adjacent stanzas. I have illustrated fully this peculiarity of the Victimae

Paschali in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" (q. v., under the title, Victimae Paschali Laudes Immolent Christiani). Now the French cento follows this plan (while the English cento has no plan), but modernizes the plan somewhat by making the four stanzas perfectly equal in syllabication.

Shall we then suppose that, in the eight stanzas which perhaps formed originally the full poem, the English happened to choose four which had no stanzaic plan, while the French chose four which had a perfect stanzaic plan? It seems hardly credible.

It would seem preferable to conclude that the author simply expressed his thought in unmetrical form in the English cento, and that when the hymn nevertheless attained popularity, the French seized on the first stanza as a type and constructed, upon that type, the remaining four stanzas of the French cento. (I have used the word "cento" loosely throughout for the sake of convenience.) The distance in time between the year 1750 (in which year the English cento is first met with) and the year 1822 (in which year the French cento is first met with) would tend to support my conjecture.

As there is not at present any reason for supposing the hymn to be an ancient one, the obligation of close fidelity in its translation into English becomes correspondingly attenuated; and it would be quite permissible in a translator, desirous of having English words which would fit well into the lovely melody to which the Adeste Fideles is traditionally wedded, to attempt regularity in the English prosody at any necessary sacrifice of fidelity to the original Latin text. I can well understand why the Marists prefer the easily sung French cento in their American Catholic Hymnal.

While the numerical syllabication of stanza 4 ("Stella duce Magi") is exactly similar to that of the other stanzas in the French cento, the accentuation of the words proves refractory in the singing, and French Paroissiens, Eucologes, and hymnals appear generally to omit it. I have found all five stanzas (numbers 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6), however, in an undated Paroissien published at Paris (possibly the same volume as Brooke refers to, which he thinks was published about the year 1868), and also in an undated Paroissien published at Limoges.

The selection of stanzas varies in the other books which I have examined, but none gives any stanza (except, of course, the first) of the English Cento. Thus only stanzas 1, 3, 5 and 6 are given in the Eucologe Romain (Paris, 1876), used in the houses of the Society of Jesus; in Les Principaux Chants Liturgiques, etc. (Paris, 1875), and in Recueil d'anciens at de nouveaux Cantiques Notés (Paris, 1886). Only the two last-mentioned books give the melody, of course, and it is the traditional tune (with slight variations in

the former one). Curiously enough, the Paroissien Complet (*sic!*), published at Limoges in 1842, does not give the hymn at all. Mr. Brooke refers to the Paroissien Complet du Diocèse d'Autun (Autun, 1837), the Amiens Paroissien of 1844, the Rouen Paroissien of 1873, and the Office de St. Olmer (St. Omers, 1822) as giving stanzas 1, 3, 5 and 6, and further notes that the Paroissien Complet (Paris, 1827) gives the English Cento of four stanzas under the heading, "Hymne qui se chante, dans plusiers églises de Paris pendant le temps de la Nativité" (p. 583), and follows this with stanzas 1, 3, 5 and 6 of the French Cento, under the heading, "Hymne pour le temps de Noël."

In Chevalier's "Repertorium Hymnologicum" (1889, in the "Analecta Bollandiana") and in the supplement (Ib., 1900) I find references to a Processional (1837), a book of Proses (1863), a Vesperal (1865), an (undated) Cistercian Gradual, a Séez volume (1872), etc., and finally a reference to "Julian's Dictionary." It would appear, therefore, that Chevalier found the hymn only in publications subsequent to the year 1822, the year of the Office of St. Omer. Now the English Cento goes back, as we have seen, to the middle of the eighteenth century, and its earliest known printed form occurs in the 1760 edition of the "Evening Office of the Church" (London), where the hymn is introduced with the direction: "From the Nativity of Our Lord to the Purification, exclusive; whilst Benediction is giving, is sung Adeste Fideles, etc." We thus perceive that, even in its printed form, it is older by sixty years than the Office of St. Omer (St. Omers, 1822).

The English and French centos are—with the exception of the first stanza—so distinct from each other, and the distinction has been kept up so consistently in the traditional uses of either country, that a different authorship for each is quite within the limits of probability.

The French cento has been attributed to Etienne Jean Francois Borderies, born at Montauban in 1764, who was consecrated Bishop of Versailles in 1827, and died there in 1832. He edited a Breviary (1828) and a Missal (1832) for his diocese. The Adeste does not occur in either volume, but is in the "Graduel noté a l'usage de Versailles," published at Versailles three years after his death. Born as he was in 1764, he could be the author only of the French cento; and even this seems improbable, as that cento was used at St. Omers in 1822; that is to say, thirteen years before it appeared in the "Versailles Graduale" of 1835.

But, quite apart from the question of the wholly distinct uses and datings of the two centos, there is, as we have pointed out, such a vast distinction in the material forms of the stanzas of either

cento that it seems quite possible that the English cento is simply the complete original form of the hymn, and that the French cento is merely a much later addition—or substitution for it—made in the interests of symmetry and singableness.

In this connection it is important to notice a statement made in the article in "The Dolphin" (p. 710) to which I have had occasion to refer several times in the present article. The statement in question takes the form of an assertion of fact, whereas there is much reason to believe that it is an unconsciously made assumption—an assumption which itself is based on another assumption. The statement runs thus: "Whilst the Clongowes manuscript has merely the tune, the Stonyhurst volume has words and music. In the latter manuscript there are only four verses—the first, second, seventh and eighth of the full text; and the music is given for each stanza, the hymn being headed 'In Nativitate Domini Hymnus,' or, as it was more generally termed, 'Christmas Hymn.' Thus in 1750 the original eight verses had been reduced to the present cento, but it is of interest to state that the Latin verses generally sung at the same period in France were the first, third, fifth and sixth."

A first assumption made in the last sentence of the quoted statement is that "in 1750 the *original eight verses* had been reduced to the present cento" of four stanzas (namely, the first, second, seventh and eighth of the English form of the hymn). There is really nothing to show that the hymn had originally eight stanzas. On the contrary, there is great reason to suppose that the hymn had originally only four stanzas—the four, that is to say, whoch are almost universally employed in our English hymnals, and which are given in the Stonyhurst and other earliest manuscripts of the hymn. The manuscript evidence for this four-stanza form dates back to the year 1750, while the earliest witness we have of the French form of the hymn occurs in the printed volume of the year 1822.

A second assumption based on the previous one is "that the Latin verses *generally* sung *at the same period* [sc. in 1750] *in France* were the first, third, fifth and sixth." There is no evidence that any verses were sung in France before the year 1822.

III. WHICH CENTO WILL PREVAIL?

Some consideration should be given to the tendency observable in recent hymnals for English-speaking people, to replace the English cento by that one which is commonly used in France.

What I consider the ill success of this experiment might be urged as an argument to sustain the view of an English parentage for the Adeste, quite apart from the strong testimony of the datings of

the MSS. and the complete disparity of the two centos in respect of their numerical syllabication. Perhaps there may be in the case of hymns—as there is sometimes said to be in the case of human beings—an unconscious sympathy of parentage and filiation in cases where the relation is not consciously known. It is the dramatic case of the "long lost child."

Is the Adeste really of English parentage? Are the critics mistaken when they award it to a Continental—German or French—source? Perhaps the following brief story of the attempt to replace the traditional English cento by that of the French may help us to a decision, for we shall see that the supposititious child has not thriven in his new environment.

From the middle of the eighteenth century, as I have said, the stream of English tradition has borne down on its placid waters the stanzas which I have styled the English Cento. And yet, as far back as the year 1830, an attempt was made in America to float the eight stanzas of the complete hymn—just as, three years earlier (in 1827), the "Paroissien Complet," of Paris, printed both centos. Now, despite this double attempt at a merger, American hymnals have, with almost absolute unanimity, stuck to the English cento from 1830 down to the present day; and, on the other hand, the various French Paroissiens, Eucologes and hymnals appear similarly to have stuck to the traditional French cento. Is it a case of *Res clamat domino?* Do the French instinctively cling to their cento as a father is instinctively attracted to the stranger who is to be proved to be his long lost child? And, urged by the same unconscious sentiment of parentage, do the English-speaking peoples hug to their breasts the English cento?

The suggestion might have still further weight if we consider the attitude of some German editors of hymnals towards the two centos. There seems to be no good reason for hesitation in rejecting a possible German source for the Adeste, and, accordingly, these editors are able to look at the whole matter dispassionately. It is not to be wondered at, then, that they should have preferred for their hymnals the highly symmetrical French cento to the unsymmetrical English cento, even though this preference should run counter to the universal practice of the country in which their hymnals are published. They published their hymnals, that is, in America, where our traditional preference is obviously shown for the English cento, but they themselves do not share this preference, for they have no such unconscious sentiment of parental affection as will blind the eye of love to the imperfections of the English cento. Yielding simply to the exigencies of musical rhythm and adaptability of verse to melody, they select the French cento. Per-

haps the reader will bear with me while I cite some few instances. The thirty-third edition of Mohr's "Caecilia" (New York, 1909) gives only the French cento. The "Sursum Corda" (Katholisches Gesang und Gebetbuch mit Deutschem und Englischem texte), published in St. Louis in 1911, does not give the Latin text, but does give an English translation, set to the traditional tune, of the French cento. The Katholisches Gesangbuch, published in Philadelphia in 1907, gives the Latin stanzas of the French cento. Father Ludwig Bonvin's "Hosanna" (St. Louis, 1912) gives an English translation of the French cento.

The experiment of the 1830 hymnal was not a success. Its title was "A Collection of Psalms, Hymns, Anthems, etc., with the Evening Office of the Catholic Church throughout the United States, Washington, 1830." In its pages appeared, probably for the first time, the awful translation beginning with the words, "With hearts truly grateful," and attaining throughout the stanzas a most unpleasant mimicry of rhyme. Strangely enough, this translation has maintained a large circulation in Catholic hymnals. It has lasted down to our own day, and is to be found in the "American Catholic Hymnal" (New York, 1914) and in Fischer's "Series of English and Latin Hymns" arranged for four male voices (New York, 1914).

In this connection it is interesting to note that Dr. Flood ("The Dolphin," December, 1905, p. 711) credits it to Father William Young, of Dublin: "English words were adapted to the hymn about the year 1825, and another version was given by Father William Young, of Dublin, in 1840, printed with the music in the "Catholic Choralist" (Dublin) in 1842. As Father Young was regarded as a saint equally with his brother, Father Charles Young (whose life has been charmingly written by Lady Georgiana Fullerton), many readers may be glad to see this specimen by his translation, given with the music on page 712"—and nearly all of page 712 is occupied with the words of the first stanza placed under the melody. As Dr. Flood seems to place the year 1840 as the date of Father Young's translation, it is clear that either the date is wrong or that the ascription to Father Young is mistaken; for the translation had already appeared a decade of years earlier in the hymnal published at Washington (in 1830). In saying this I feel no sentiment of national pride, for I would willingly—even gratefully—give the ascription to any one who may desire it outside the circumscription of our struggling American Catholicity.

I have quoted Dr. Flood somewhat *in extenso* in order to convey the full meaning of the assertion he makes. In doing so, however, I am compelled to notice his view that the hymn had also been translated "about the year 1825." Julian's Dictionary notes seven (the

earliest is dated 1760) translations into English which appeared before the year 1825, but fails to note an excellent one which appeared in a Philadelphia hymnal edited by Benjamin Carr and dedicated to "Right Rev. John Carrol (*sic*), Bishop of Baltimore." This dedication to Bishop Carroll, of Baltimore, places the appearance of the volume as sometime before the year 1808 (for in that year Bishop Carroll became Archbishop of Baltimore). I am informed that the true date of appearance is the year 1805 (so it is marked in a copy preserved in the Library of the Pennsylvania Historical Society. The American Catholic Historical Society also possesses a copy, undated).

I have said that the tendency to replace the English by the French cento is but rarely observable in our Catholic hymnals intended for English-speaking Catholics. I have noticed it (in addition to the instances I have already noted) in the "Roman Hymnal" (New York, 1884), in the "American Catholic Hymnal" (New York, 1914). The "Arundel Hymns" (London, 1901) gives the English cento to the traditional air, and adds the French cento (omitting the *Stella duce Magi* stanza) to an original air by R. L. de Pearsall.

H. T. Henry.

Overbrook, Pa.

A FLYING TOUR OF NORTH AMERICA.

MUCH has been written of the "great powers of Europe," but when we scan the figures dealing with the areas of the various political subdivisions of the Old World, it is learned that all the Continental nations combined are only equal in actual terra firma to that newer section of the earth known to cartographers as the United States, which, of course, embraces the Territory of Alaska. If our contiguous neighbor to the north of us be included, there are perhaps 5,500,000 square miles above the Rio Grande that one day shall nurture hundreds of millions of the Caucasian race.

Our 10,000-mile journey during the summer of 1914 began at New York and continued over the gently shimmering hillocks of the Spanish Main to the chief port of the Southwest. Galveston is no longer the straggling community of old; on the contrary, the National Government and the State of Texas have walled in the outer channels, and great liners now steam to the cotton-laden wharves in perfect security. The vast seawall is completed, and the "norther" that could toss the billows eighteen feet above the level of the shore should be almost able to engulf the universe, for

it will be recalled that the entire city of Galveston has been raised several feet since the inundation of 1900, when 9,000 souls were consigned to watery graves. The broad seawall also acts as a driveway and promenade, and on Sunday excursionists from the interior come to take a plunge in the foaming whitecaps that supinely crash beneath the giant wall of stone. Here is located the handsomest inn of the Lone Star State, the Hotel Galvez, whence a fine sweep is had of the broad-spreading Mexican Gulf, while to the rear thousands of white cottages give this enterprising port the aspect of a seashore resort of large dimensions. There are many busy thoroughfares, and the elegant homes of the rich are surrounded by flora germane to tropical lands. The population is quite cosmopolitan, Germans and Hebrews being numerous, and the cafés are generally conducted by our perspicacious friends of Chinese nativity.

From Galveston the train speeds along through thriving Houston, and finally the well-tilled lands of Northern Texas come to view. The farmers are of many nationalities, Teutonic colonies being much in evidence; and while it seems only a decade or so since President McKinley opened up Oklahoma to the white man, we find Oklahoma City and Guthrie challenging centres long renowned, and as for the surrounding country, it is one vast field of corn, wheat and sugar beet; of course, the oil wells and coal beds materially add to the well-being of the State.

Some years ago an alleged wit malevolently remarked: "What's the matter with Kansas?" But an all-day ride on the end of an observation car during the month of August convinces the skeptic that the "matter with Kansas" is an enormous production of cereals that have made the natives the richest per capita in the Republic, and it is not to be wondered at that one out of every twenty owns an automobile. In 1914 Kansas raised about one-fifth of the total American wheat crop, which, all told, runs to 900,000,000 bushels. Were this wheat converted into flour it would fill over 40,000,000 barrels and make 8,500,000,000 loaves, enough to meet our nation's need in the bread line for a year. The total field crops amounted to over $300,000,000. Beyond the level lands of Kansas the population begins to dwindle, due to the paucity of the rainfall and lack of irrigation. Then comes a long ride through the treeless mountains of Colorado and New Mexico, the scenery and engineering in the vicinity of the Raton tunnel (8,000 feet above the level) being especially noteworthy.

Santa Fé, the capital of New Mexico, is eighteen miles from the main line, and is said to be the oldest town of any importance in the United States. Old Mexican adobe pueblos lend emphasis

to the claim, but the newer section is thoroughly American; however, this city amidst the stars is not destined to become a metropolis, for it is fanned by the rarefied currents that roll across the Rockies 7,000 feet above the rivulet called the Rio Grande. General Lew Wallace, who was Territorial Governor for a while, was evidently inspired by the clearness of the cerulescent dome and the placidity of his archaic surroundings to send forth from the old Governor's Palace his well-known drama, "Ben Hur." The American Institute of Archæology has its principal museum in Santa Fé and is doing very useful work pertaining to the history of the cliff-dwellers; in Frijoles Canyon 1,500 separate ruins have been excavated in this home of the lofty ancients. Las Vegas is also a spot of interesting antiquity. Divided into two parts, the old and the new, we find many of the very first families of America—Indians and Mexicans, some of whom own prosperous sheep ranches on the hills and well-kept shops in the city; and these soft-syllabled adherents of the Castilian tongue seem to be just as happy and comfortable as the more energetic Americans in the newer town. The climate is beyond compare, due to an altitude of 6,000 feet, the days being warm and dry, the hours of slumber cool enough for blankets. Rain rarely falls in New Mexico, with the result that agriculture is in a very backward condition. "Dry farming," which mainly consists of ploughing deeply and turning over and over the under sod, is generally resorted to in this section, and meets with fair success. If it were possible to disburse a few of the millions upon irrigation that we annually expend upon the upkeep of our naval and military departments, New Mexico would become the home of several million prosperous citizens. Albuquerque is the principal city of the State, and the stranger who walks along Central avenue quite naturally thinks he is in a big metropolis, for there are few places in the world that display greater energy than is found in this little city of 15,000 inhabitants. The westbound train now rolls across a land of interest to the student of geology, for several miles to the left we view the prostrate and storm-beaten monoliths that once shaded the aisles of an immense and ancient park; and if the Petrified Forest possesses its own peculiar charms, the titanic escarpments and bottomless chasms of the Grand Canyon of Arizona are prospects as sublime as they are baffling. There is not a place of any importance between Albuquerque and Prescott, the heart of the copper region of Arizona. Perhaps no human mind can thoroughly grasp the singular formation of the earth, and it would indeed be an able pen that could faithfully portray the diversified landscape lying between Ash Fork and Phœnix. At the north are hills as bleak as they

are bare, and at the south green and heavy pines cover the lofty terrace; here a waste of sand and cacti, there a pasture of well-fed sheep, and as we roll toward the south the rails abruptly curve and bend to round the enormous rocks that thwarted the cunning of that eminent genius of transportation—the American engineer. An altitude of 5,000 feet gives Prescott a good climate, but as the track descends in the vicinity of Phœnix the rails drop 2,000 feet in fourteen miles, with the result that coats and collars are quite an incubus, even in the various houses of worship. Irrigated fruit orchards keep the handsome capital in operation during the heated term, and the "idle born" from the East throng many beautiful bungalows and apartment houses from fall to spring. Of course, the popular opinion prevails that Arizona is the habitat of the merry bandit, the rapid-fire outlaw, the dark-masked train robber and the light-fingered artist who deals himself an "ace full" with one hand while fondly fingering a repeater with the other; every shack is a barroom and the adjoining domicile a Bacchanalian hall of song and inebriation. Perhaps all these things were true in the dim and distant long ago, and perhaps they were merely the chimerical ebullitions of those argus-eyed scribes of the "tuppenny terror" variety. But times change and the people with the times, and now we behold barred and bolted shutters on each and every "ambrosial parlor" within the broad confines of prohibition Arizona! Unfortunates suffering from pulmonary and throat diseases find much relief in this anti-humid atmosphere, and this is one reason why the handsome hospital conducted by the Sisters of Charity is such a popular institution.

The vast Roosevelt Dam has done much for the southern part of Arizona, but the train does not roll through vast orchards until the sun-scorched sand dunes of the Mojave Desert have been crossed and the aromatic fields of San Bernardino, California, are reached. Now we view oranges and peaches, grapes and flowers in great abundance all the way to Los Angeles, a city boasting a population of 400,000 and truly a wonderful cosmopolis, for costly buildings line the sides of many broad avenues. What keeps this large town in motion is a mystery to every one, for factories are as scarce as visitors are numerous; but perhaps the vast array of opulent transients and the innumerable oil wells within the city limits help materially to enrich the community, while the fruit trade of the various valleys is nothing short of stupendous. The electric car system is said to be unequaled, fast and commodious lines operating to Santa Monica, San Diego and Long Beach, on the coast, and the old Franciscan missions in the outlying sections of the country. Pasadena is beyond all doubt one of the most beau-

tiful spots on this earth, and there is good reason for its development into a winter pleasure ground of the affluent of many States. Roses bloom throughout the year, and the summers are never too warm for comfort. Palaces of millionaires line the captivating avenues to such a degree that one imagines himself driving through the realms of fairyland. A famous chewing-gum baron, an eminent liver pill doctor, a popular shoe-polish king and a brewer of brews that have made a city "famous" are all lords of gorgeous manors. The sunken gardens on the Adolph Busch estate are open to the public, and they truly typify the noblest work of the landscape artist. Almost every species of plant life is to be found on the sloping ridges and terraces of this semi-public park.

Very comfortable steamships connect at San Diego for San Francisco, and there are also two railroads leading to the big port, the Southern Pacific coast line and the Santa Fé inside route. The ocean ride presents many magnificent vistas, for on the right the towering peaks of the Santa Ynez fling high their rugged brows, and on the left the enraptured eye sweeps the broad-spreading Pacific's swell to the distant horizon. It is indeed a fascinating tour, and as the roadbed serpentines in and around the flowery ridges of the Sierra Madre the traveler gets a good view of the adobe missions established by the dauntless Spanish padres a generation ere the American Revolution was fought and won. It requires twelve hours to cover the 500 miles dividing Los Angeles from San Francisco, and visitors usually break their ride at Santa Barbara, one of the fairest towns of California. It was in this placid habitat of the aborigine, in 1786, that the real pioneer of the far West—the Franciscan friar—gathered together his pagan forbears of a darker hue and suffused their souls with a spiritual love that later found material exemplification in the well-known Santa Barbara Mission. The discordant clang-clang of the modern car seems to profane the sacred air surrounding this hallowed shrine; naught but elysian chimes could be harmonious in this rose-embowered tabernacle of the Prince of Peace. Later on we approach San José, a city of exceptional wealth and beauty and the principal depot of the Santa Clara Valley fruit region. Climatic conditions are ideal, and orchards sell as high as $1,500 an acre. A powerful glass can bring home the Lick Observatory, perched on top of Mount Hamilton, and after a half-hour's ride along a tree-bordered avenue, the sightseer strolls across the broad campus of Santa Clara College, inaugurated by the Rev. John Nobili, S. J., in 1851 and now a well-equipped university attended by 500 students. The meteorological department is the most important institution of its kind on the Slope. Palo Alto also boasts a great seat

of learning, the Leland Stanford Junior University, founded by Senator and Mrs. Stanford as a memorial to their son; it is said that the generous couple placed the huge sum of $26,000,000 at the disposal of the management. The University of California is located in Berkeley, and owns several handsome buildings, but the much-talked-of Greek Theatre is vastly overrated, for it is circumscribed in size and cheaply constructed of rough cement.

San Francisco bears but slight resemblance to the town that went up in smoke in 1906. Market street is now lined with "skyscrapers" and "flatirons" in countless numbers; even the aristocratic Van Ness avenue, for many years one of the principal residence streets of the Argonaut patricians, has been invaded by sordid chambers of commerce, while the mammonized air without resounds with the vibrant clang of the plebeian trolley. The Panama Canal Exposition will undoubtedly take the palm as being the "greatest show on earth," as Mr. Barnum was wont to say. The buildings are numerous beyond computation, and from the deck of an outbound ship they resemble the castles and palaces of some celestial potentate we read of on the page of fable. The structures are of every size, every hue, every design; and when we view the macadamized boulevards and the full-grown palm trees lining the route of the pedestrian—for vehicles will not be permitted within the grounds—our American blood throbs with pride through our pulsating veins. It is regrettable that such artistic structures are of ephemeral mould and that within a few months shall be consigned to oblivion. However, several of the more important buildings are destined to remain the treasures of future generations.

They have a way of doing things all their own out in the Western country, and just as San Francisco emerged from the débris in the space of three years, so the towns across the bay have emulated its example. Oakland was merely shaken by the earthquake, and this fact resulted in driving thousands of San Franciscans to sleep on the northern shore of the four-mile bay. Alameda, Berkeley and Oakland now claim a population of 300,000; moreover, the climate is warmer and clearer than that enjoyed by the larger city, which during the fall and winter is frequently overcast by a funereal pall.

California only bows to Texas in matters of girth, for the tremendous length of the Golden State (800 miles) eclipses by 100 miles the length of Italy, and its area (158,360 square miles) is greater than the Adriatic peninsula and Portugal combined. It is asserted that there are nearly 50,000,000 acres of land under cultivation in the State, while another 50,000,000 are given over to pasturage, forests and mining lands; there are also 40,000,000 fruit trees of almost every variety, and when the Panama Canal is in

full working order these luscious products are destined to reach the Eastern States and Europe at prices somewhat less than those hitherto prevailing. The steamship schedule will be about seventeen days from San Francisco to New York.

The Pacific Coast Steamship Company operates the best line to Victoria and Seattle, and the sixty-hour voyage is usually pleasant during the summer months, but cold and choppy in winter. The coast range is desolate and barren, and a heavy mist frequently overhangs the rugged hills that surround the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the dividing line between the United States and Vancouver Island. Seattle possesses many characteristics, the chief of which are rush and rain, for everybody and everything deem it expedient to rush the livelong day, and even after the midnight chimes announce the approach of another morn. If the heavenly flood-gates are not pitching their volumes upon the greatest port and city of the Northwest, the forty-two stories of the Smith building, the tallest structure west of New York, are easily discerned shortly after the ship has passed Port Townsend; immediately to the rear, high upon an eminence—for Seattle is a city of hills—soar heaven-ward the lofty towers of new and stately St. James' Cathedral. The capacious edifice is constructed of yellow brick, and the same is true of the various buildings of the parish. So steep are several inclines that the old-style cable system is still in use for street cars running east and west. Seattle is such an ultra-modern city that penny-in-the-slot machines sell newspapers at many convenient corners, and the citizens are drawn from every land and clime beneath the illimitable void on high.

The Canadian Pacific Railway operates comfortable boats to Victoria and Vancouver. It is an all-day sail, allowing three hours at Victoria, Vancouver Island, a pretty little English city, and, of course, the stately Parliament Buildings and the large Empress Hotel lend much dignity to this exceptionally clean, well-lighted, well-paved capital of British Columbia. The town is so English that automobiles and "trams" always keep to the left when driving past the American-like shops on Government and Yates streets; and then there is the very formidable-looking "bobby," with the strap of his spiked helmet reposing an inch or so above his imperial chin; but he is a suave and gentle chap withal, and says, "Oh, aye, sir!" just as the bluecoats of a larger English capital have been known to say. Raindrops are not very numerous in little Victoria, so hundreds of transpacific tourists make their temporary home at the big inn while awaiting the departure of the fleet Oriental liners from Vancouver. The sail up the Straits of Georgia is indeed a revelation as the steamer swings around the innumerable

bends and captivating archipelagos leading to Haro Strait. Birds of every hue winging high and low, rugged rocks sparsely dotted with brush, and islands heavily covered with yellow pine, all environed by miniature mountains, combine to make this placid trip one of the pleasantest days of the sightseer's itinerary.

Vancouver is the principal city and port of Western Canada, differing but slightly from the ordinary American community of 250,000 inhabitants. In fact, if it were not for the left-handed English style of driving and the London cut of the policemen's uniforms, the visitor strolling along busy Hastings or Granville street would never know he was temporarily paying tribute to the British King. There are 25,000 Americans in the town; the balance are mainly of English and Scottish nativity, with a sprinkling of those scions of ubiquity, the wandering Celts. A superabundance of rain spoils an otherwise equable climate, as extremes of heat or cold do not prevail. Shaughnessy Heights is the rendezvous of the élite, and many regal homes superciliously scan the humble but honest habitations of the bourgeois in the far-flung vale below.

It is erroneous to assume that the climate of British Columbia is cold and bleak; on the contrary, the Japanese Current warms the coast line, while in the interior the Chinook winds keep the mercury well above freezing point during most of the winter months. The Province is of immense area—700 miles long and 400 wide—and contains ore of many strata; salmon fisheries are also very important. A new railroad, the Grand Trunk Pacific, is preparing to open its new terminal at Prince Rupert, 500 miles north of Vancouver. It is stated that a high-salaried professor of nomenclature has been engaged to fashion names for the towns that follow in the trail of the onrushing section gangs.

The afternoon train out of Vancouver gives the romanticist an opportunity of viewing the tremendous breastworks Cyclopean strategists of a distant epoch flung skyward to harass the progress of the ravaging Titans. The train rolls along through a sparsely settled and uninteresting country until Kamloops is reached, and now we begin to zigzag around the curving banks of mountain-encased Lake Shuswap and on to Revelstoke, at which point we take on an extra mogul to draw us up and down the entrancing aisles of the most gorgeous Selkirks. Now we quiver as the foaming cascade tumbles down the ridges of Illicillewaet into the depths of Albert Canyon on our left, while tossing its frosty crown thousands of feet amidst the blue, we slowly wind around and around the rugged slopes of that vast mound known as the Great Glacier; here a chasm of awful depth, there a snow-domed monarch of exalted mien; now creeping through Rogers Pass and roaring

like mad down the steeps of Bear Creek Gorge, the belching engines momentarily halt to prepare for the heart-stilling leap across the boisterous Stony Creek, which rolls away 300 feet below. The bridge, one of the highest on earth, is supported from the sides of friendly crags.

But the shadows of the giants grow longer, and Old Sol glides away to flash his effulgent glare upon Oriental fields; so we spend a night at the high-class inn operated by the railway company. At early morn the orb of day spreads his crimson mantle over this mundane paradise, and the fascinated eye beholds the glistening palisades that garb the imperious queen that haughtily surveys the regions 12,000 feet above us, the ever-snow-capped Victoria Glacier. It is also at Laggan that we take the serpentine railway that leads up to Lake Louise and the Lakes in the Clouds, bodies of shimmering ripples that have no compeers on the planet, and it will be recalled that they are nearly 6,000 feet above the sea. Banff is also the mecca of the mountain-climber and the seeker after health, for the hot sulphur springs are said to possess medicinal qualities of great worth to invalids. The Canadian Rocky Mountain Park is 600 miles in length, and every turn of the head brings to view a thousand vistas that outrank the ridges and vales of the Valais region of Switzerland. It is a day of the marvels of nature, and at Field we view the marvels of man—spiral tunnels 3,000 feet long that actually double the track and the Kicking Horse River at least twice before reaching the open. The mountain division is subject to heavy falls of snow in winter, and long stretches of track are protected by miles of snowsheds. Of course, this vast amphitheatre of spectral pyramids, canyons that know no base and entrancing cascades beyond the skies brings hither thousands of tourists from many lands; but the day is not remote when the mineral treasures of the Selkirks will be unlocked and fashioned into girders of steel, columns of granite, tokens of exchange and vanities for the adornment of the fair.

Ten years ago Calgary was a cluster of frame houses; to-day it is a city of 60,000 souls and the principal market of the great wheat belt of Alberta, many fine business blocks on Eighth avenue and elegant homes in the Mount Royal district attesting the richness of the earth. Oil is also a valuable asset, little "exchanges" being located at every step, and there are perhaps more "near speculators" in Calgary than in any other city anywhere; in fact, the man in the street juggles with millions with all the blasé characteristic of Barnum's famous juggler in tossing daggers to and fro. The Canadian Pacific Railway evidently puts great faith in the future of Calgary, for it recently completed a ten-story hotel at

an outlay of $2,000,000—and this on a site overrun with bison less than a generation ago. Edmonton, the capital of Alberta, lies two hundred miles to the north, and is fashioned along American lines, while Saskatoon, Regina, Medicine Hat and Moose Jaw have all had prodigious growth; but like everything else in a new country, things have been greatly overdone, with the result that Northwestern Canada is now undergoing a serious financial depression. Moreover, the cost of living is higher than in many sections of the United States.

From Calgary to Winnipeg the land is as level as a billiard table, trees being as scarce as wheat fields are numerous. The "Chicago of Canada" contains perhaps 250,000 people and acts as the "jobbing house" of Manitoba. A department store on Portage avenue is seven stories high and covers an entire city block; the well-known Hudson's Bay Company is now preparing plans for a larger structure. As illustrating the rapid growth of the prairie city, a shrewd American speculator visited the town a dozen years ago and bought the aristocratic Crescent Woods section for $14 an acre; to-day the same ground sells for $20,000 per acre. St. Boniface, just across the Red River, boasts a population of 20,000, nearly all of whom are French-Canadians, and the Gallic tongue is spoken from the pulpit of the metropolitan Cathedral. Winnipegians may have their faults, but it would be conducive to the well-being of society if their laudable example of closing drinking places at 8 o'clock on Saturday night were put into universal operation. The much-talked-of railroad to Hudson Bay may be an actuality within the next decade, the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific having completed the line to Le Pas, 400 miles north of Regina; another 300 miles remain to be tracked, and then the long grain trains will speed to the side of Liverpool-bound ships, thus saving 800 miles over the run to Montreal. Hudson Bay is clear of ice sixteen weeks during the summer season.

From Winnipeg to Fort William the country is barren and rocky, though its pristine simplicity presents many vistas well worth viewing. There are only two or three small towns in the 400-mile run to the grain-exporting cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, located at the western end of Lake Superior. The track now begins to skirt the northern shore of Lake Superior for the better part of the day, and the scenery, while the antithesis of the Selkirks, is in many respects the equal of the mountain district. On the left we see a rocky, desolate country and on the right the ceaseless roll of the largest lake on the globe; far to the south naught but the undulation of the great abyss comes to view. The region bears a strong resemblance to the coast of Newfoundland, for here are

found the high, rugged, wind-swept cliffs and the perennial rise and fall of the breakers crashing against the towering bastions; as far as the eye can scan we view virgin forests and gigantic steeps lining the circuitous shore of this vast inland ocean; not a habitation save a summer hut of the ubiquitous angler, and from these dismal solitudes comes the melancholy "caw-caw" of the winging hawk. It is indeed a wild and rock-bound coast, and shall so remain until some magic hand transmutes enormous boulders into productive soil. The railroad bed in many places has been blasted through solid rock. As an illustration of the paucity of population, there are but three towns between Fort William and Ottawa, a distance of nearly 900 miles. Taking the Canadian Pacific Railway as a whole, it is truly one of the wonders of the world.

Sightseers may also travel east from Fort William via the water route, which leads across Lake Superior through Sault Sainte Marie Canal to Port McNichol, on Lake Huron, thus securing a two-day sea trip and gaining some knowledge of the enormous traffic passing through the "Soo." In 1845 one horse hauled all the freight that passed between Lake Huron and Lake Superior; ten years later the traffic amounted to 14,000 tons a year; to-day the figures baffle the ordinary mind, for upward of 75,000,000 tons of freight of all kinds sail annually through the canal. The Panama Canal is an infantile affair in comparison with the "Soo," for the latest of the three locks is 1,350 feet long, against 1,000 feet for the Panama. The tonnage of the "Soo" is said to be greater than that of the combined commerce of New York, London, Liverpool and Hamburg.

The rocky country abounds on either hand until the comfortable farms fifty miles west of Ottawa begin to dot the landscape; but the entrance to the capital is far from inspiring, for the town of Hull is a miserable conglomeration of frame habitations that have seen better days. Nor does Ottawa hold high rank among Canadian cities. The Parliament Buildings are imposing, it is true, and the flower beds on the broad plaza are very attractive, but the various Government offices offer no inspiration to the visitor seeking designs for the erection of a model institution. The Grand Trunk Station is stately and very well laid out, but it should stand alone to properly emphasize the dignity of its architectural lines. Excepting the main wing of the Parliament group, the Chateau Laurier is the only building of importance in the capital city of Canada. Several shops on Sparks and Bank streets are tall and costly, but the houses of ancient lineage sandwiched in between shed no lustre on their richer neighbors. Street paving could be much improved,

for when it rains the highways are almost impassable on account of mud. However, a brave effort is being made to build modern homes in the Britannia Park section, and the same is true of the Rockliffe district, wherein dwells in a regal domicile His Excellency the Viceroy of Canada. It should be said in behalf of the 90,000 citizens of Ottawa, one-third of whom are French-Canadians, that the Federal Government contributes but little in the way of taxes, differing in this respect from our own Congress, which pays one-half the running expenses of Washington.

From Ottawa to Montreal the landscape takes on the aspect of ancient Gaul, for all signs along the route are of French formation. The metropolis of Canada is simply a reproduction of an American municipality of 600,000 people. The city grows rapidly and is solidly built from Lachine for miles beyond Mount Royal, sections sparsely settled a dozen years ago. French and English are jointly used in commercial intercourse, and both languages are official, but the former tongue is in vogue among two-thirds of the population, who hold their predominance by virtue of their numerous offspring; six, eight and ten children are the rule—a sharp contrast in comparison with the microscopic families of the motherland beyond the seas. The city contains thousands of "flats," and in many cases there are flights of twenty steps leading to the second story. The ancient faith finds a responsive chord in the hearts of the populace, and Notre Dame, with its two galleries, hand-carved chapel and magnificent paintings, seats at least twelve thousand worshipers. St. James' Cathedral is fully completed, and it is regrettable that a less sombre stone was not used in its erection; the Anglican Cathedral is an unpretentious edifice; the Methodists have a large church, and the Presbyterians are likewise well represented; our friends of the Hebrew persuasion possess a spacious synagogue.

The European strife and poor crops in the far West have put a serious damper on Canadian business from Halifax to Vancouver, and it should not be forgotten that "Our Lady of the Snows" is a commonwealth in formation and needs millions of money to develop her natural resources. These funds have hitherto come from England, but Dominion bankers must now look to the United States for financial assistance.

William S. Long.

Camden, N. J.

THE GORDON RIOTS.

"For first the Church of Rome condemned us, and we likewise them."
—Sir Thomas Browne.

IT IS an old story that the Puritans came to America to worship God in their own fashion and compelled every one else to do the same. There has been too much compulsion about this matter of religion. The Christian faith is based on a principle which necessitates freedom of the will. The Roman persecution of early Christians, the successive Tudor reigns of anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant persecution, the persecution of the Catholic Faith in modern Mexico—all these are crimes against humanity. Of course, there is the single justification that the man who does this sort of thing thinks he fights and eradicates a greater wrong than the wrong of persecution itself. But the Spanish Inquisition, through the over-zealousness of Phillip, got a very bad name. James of England became so ardent an agitator that the Pope had to warn him against "too great zeal." The propaganda of a religion should not be carried on by the use of the torture-chamber or mob-violence. If the well-meaning and sincere Philip of Spain, if Mary of England made mistakes, we might reply that for every item of Catholic cruelty we can balance one of Protestant cruelty. We can reply that the Church faces Gethsemane every day, that the Catholics of the twentieth century are at one with Catholics of the first in matters of persecution, as well as in matters of faith. But the *tu quoque* answer is no adequate reply. The accusation of wrongdoing against enemies returns with equal force against the friends we may some day wish to defend. There is, however, a very powerful and a very convincing reply which has been made by Mgr. Benson. But I shall not give it here. I am intending to speak of the Gordon Riots, and, lest my Protestant friends think I am finding fault on a minor detail, I have taken this introductory paragraph to show that I believe Catholics and Protestants are alike at fault when they think to accomplish aught by force of massed numbers. Religious differences should not be made into items of political principle. It shall be my purpose to show a most lamentable example of some such attempt, and to draw from it some lesson for ourselves, some lesson that mere show of numbers and use of violence may result in dishonor rather than in success.

It is a matter of the merest chance that I have approached this problem from the incident of the Gordon Riots of 1780 rather than in any other more important way. I have thought the matter out from this point of view, and, trivial and unimportant as the riots may seem to us today, I shall retain the point of view simply because

it is mine, and because it is I who happen to be writing this essay. Some two years ago I began to make some studies concerning Thomas Holcroft, a British radical, a novelist and playwright of no mean ability, a facile penman, and an extremely interesting man whose opinions were, to use the words of a contemporary, "sometimes so strange and sometimes so good." I soon ran across two titles among his works, each of which dealt with these Gordon Riots[1]:

A plain and succinct account of the late riots, London; printed for Fielding and Walker, 1780.

The trial of the Hon. George Gordon for high treason at the bar of the Court of King's Bench, London; printed for Fielding and Walker, 1781.

The first of these Lecky (3:520) praised very highly when he wrote his history of eighteenth century England. In addition to these books, I have, of course, consulted the authentic histories of the period, as well as the *Annual Register,* the magazines, the *Commons Journal*[2], letters and memoirs of the time, and also another very curious pamphlet:

Fanaticism and treason or a dispassionate history of the rise, progress and suppression of the rebellious insurrection in June, 1780, *by a real friend to religion and to Britain, London; printed for G. Kearsy,* 1780.

And, again, if I am asked why I chance to approach the subject from the standpoint of Holcroft, I shall reply that that it is the way in which I first became interested, that that is the perspective I want, that this is but a part of and brief notes toward a larger study which I am making, a study of Holcroft and not of religion. But, lest any one accuse me of having ulterior motives in selecting this angle of attack, I may remark that the attitude of a revolutionary radical which I assume for a time can scarcely be construed as prejudicially Catholic. Quite the contrary! In a long poem of Holcroft's, entitled *Human Happiness, or the Skeptic,* my author has shown himself quite violently anti-Catholic. In his novel *Anna St. Ives* (1792)[4], he was twice guilty of flagrant misunderstanding, if not misinterpretation, especially when he speaks of the "papists," as he calls them, "their ignorant adoration of the rags and rotten wood which they themselves dress up, the protection afforded the most atrocious criminals if they can but escape to a mass of stone which they call sacred." Surely, after this, no one can accuse me of being prejudiced

[1] See my "Bibliography of Thomas Holcroft," in "Notes and Queries," XI. series, Vol. X., pp. 43-46.

[2] Vol. XXXVII., year 1780, p. 908ff.

[3] Issued on 22d June, 1780.

[4] Vol. I., p. 168; Vol. II., p. 5.

opinions and testimony, when the very writer upon whom I make myself chiefly dependent seems to have committed himself elsewhere. And it is not my intention to attack Holcroft. I intend to use him. I am speaking in this essay primarily of the opinion of a radical on "mob religion," not of religion itself. As my friend, Father Conway, has said, the Church is always suspicious, and justly so, of the lay theologian. Therefore, I comment on the evils of fanaticism of all sorts, not on the principles of fanaticism; on the evils of the Gordon Riots, not on their religious foundation; on Holcroft's opinions, not on the Catholic defense. As Sir Thomas Browne said—in another context, to be sure—"Men have lost their reason in nothing so much as in their religion." And, after all, I am strongly tempted to quote from our "real friend" pamphlet, where he mentions Voltaire:

> "No! Such atrocities as these will never be imitated. Philosophy, the sister of religion, has herself snatched the poignard from the hands of superstition, so long bathed in blood; and the human understanding, recovered from its delirium, stands amazed at the shocking brutalities into which it has been hurried by enthusiasm[5].

Before I say a few words about religious liberty, I shall take the liberty of making another quotation to show the colors of Lord George Gordon:

> "All the true friends of Great Britain, and of civil and religious liberty, are exhorted to unite in support of the protestant interest before it is too late; for unanimity and firmness in that glorious cause can alone protect us from the *dangerous confederacy of Popish powers.* If we unite like one man, for the honor of God, and the liberties of the people, we may yet experience the blessing of Divine Providence on this kingdom, and love and confidence may again be restored amongst brethren. But if we continue obstinate in errors, and spread idolatry and corruption through the land, we have nothing to expect but division among the people, distraction in the Senate, and discontent in our camp, with all the other calamities of those nations whom God has delivered over to arbitary power and depotism.[6]
>
> (Signed) G. Gordon.

So this is his manifesto!

I believe it was that very capable woman, Mme. Roland, who emitted the much-quoted phrase, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are

[5] F. & T.

[6] From "Plain Account;" cf. also p. 52 of the same pamphlet for similar reference to "civil and religious liberties of this country."

committed in thy name!" And in these days when the worst violations of our modern idea of religious toleration are masquerading as acts in the defense of "freedom," when the Guardians of Liberty, the A. P. A. and the *Menace,* pretend so violently to protect the religious liberty of America, there must be a certain ironic smile aroused when we hear of Lord George Gordon proclaiming himself as a patriot. It is, therefore, interesting to remember that those whom we call the "radicals" of the 1790's, the revolutionary sympathizers, were spoken of contemptuously as "levellers" and "patriots." Dr. Johnson, in the fourth edition of his dictionary (1773), spoke of the term "patriot" as follows: "It is sometimes used for a factious disturber of the government[7];" and on another occasion[8] spoke rather violently against Jack Wilkes and some other "patriotic friends." But perhaps we had better be a bit careful in our discussion of these men. Their chief defense must be their sincerity. Whatever we, with the perspective of over a hundred years, may see in their actions that was wrong, we must admit that they probably believed in their actions. As Chesterton says, "It is too much the custom in politics to describe a political opponent as utterly inhumane, as utterly careless of his country, as utterly cynical, which no man ever was since the beginning of the world." They thought they did what was best, they were not unpatriotic, they were not utterly self-seeking, or barbarous and revengeful. Whatever their deeds, we who cannot read their minds must not condemn their motives. With their deeds alone we must deal, from their deeds we may draw lessons for ourselves; but we must be charitable, and not expect them to learn the theories which the error of their actions brought to light.

If we are to deal with facts, we have a stupendous array before us from which to select. I have already tried to draw some limitations, but must now be even more arduous in my selection and rejection. In the words of the "real friend to religion and to Britain," I might say:

> "The exact damage that was done to every member's coat, the quantity of powder that was beaten out of every head, the number of blows and bruises that every lord received, no reader is solicitous to learn. There is a kind of dignity about great and national distresses which will not suffer a feeling mind to dwell upon anything mean or low. When every law, divine and human, has been insulted, when

[7] Birbede-Hill's edition of Boswell's Johnson, Vol. IV., p. 87n. Hereafter "Boswell" shall indicate this edition, F. & T., the "Fanaticism and Treason" pamphlet listed above, "Plain Account," Holcroft's narrative of the riots, and "Trial," Holcroft's pamphlet on the Trial.

[8] Boswell, iii., 66.

> the constitution itself has been almost trampled under foot, he must have a paltry soul who can stop to relate, or to peruse, an account of the damage done to an earl's *vis-à-vis*, or of the rage vented upon the shins even of the lord president of the council."[9]

Many things happened. It chanced that there was on the statute books an Act of William IV, virtually unenforced, which was—in the words of the prosecuting attorney—"a disgrace to the nation," for it placed Catholics under such disabilities as the tolerance of the times could scarcely permit of being enforced, according to the "severity of this act." In 1778, Sir George Savile, in view of "the peaceful behavior" of the Catholics and "the loyal and excellent address they had lately presented to the throne," had wished by means of a Relief Act "to vindicate the honor and assert the principles of the Protestant religion."[10] At his instigation, the bill in question was brought in (Mr. Dunning seconded it) and passed without a single negative. This allowed those Catholics who would subscribe the free exercise of their religion in licensed chapels, put them on equal terms with Presbyterians and all other Dissenters, and granted them "toleration to erect schools for the education of youth." The attorney general said:[11] "In order to obtain any benefit by it, there was an oath required as a pledge of the people's loyalty, renouncing, in the strongest terms, all civil and temporal authority of the Pope or sovereign potentate, in these realms, and abjuring all pretensions of the abdicated family of the house of Stuart, or any other pretender. Under this act many took this oath, and no one was dissatisfied until there was a talk of carrying the repeal into Scotland." We recall at this point that Sir Thomas More, the most conspicuous martyr of the English Reformation, had stood ready to acknowledge the temporal, but not the spiritual, authority of the English King, to repudiate the temporal, but not the spiritual, authority of the Pope. The bill seemed just and became a law. It seemed necessary. The "real friend to religion and Britain" remarked[12] that Sir George Savile's Bill granted "not improper indulgences." Catholics were still by legislation prohibited from teaching schools unless licensed in the ordinary way, unless they conformed and attended the legal worship. If they heard or said Mass, they were subject to 100 marks' fine or imprisonment; they must not own arms nor come within ten miles of London, nor travel more than five miles from home, or they would forfeit their

[9] F. & T., p. 42.

[10] "Plain Account," pp. 1-6, contains the Act itself. It may also be seen in the "Annual Register" for 1780.

[11] Trial, p. 16.

[12] F. & T.

goods; nor send any one (not even children) abroad for education on pain of legal disability. Conversion amounted to treason. Boasted English liberty, if not common decency, seemed to demand the repeal which Parliament, at the instigation of our Protestant friend, Sir George Savile, was quick to grant.

As the attorney general said, all went well "until there was talk of carrying the repeal into Scotland." "This produced an insurrection at Edinburgh in the year 1779, where several houses and chapels were burned. And to quell this, the interference of the magistrates, and aid of the military, were found ineffectual, until the provost of Edinburgh pledged himself that the measure was given up."[13] Lord Gordon had previously distinguished himself in Parliament by reading various wild and impossible motions which were not only lost, but which even went unseconded. The Scotch resistance contributed to spread the alarm; Lord Gordon evidently recognized his own futility in Parliament and wished to have the support of a well-backed petition for his repealing bill. The right of the subject to petition was acknowledged, its success had been demonstrated in the "Legion's Address," and the attorney general believed that "nothing was at first intended by the protestant association, but a decent and rational exercise of that right."[14] So bills were dispersed and advertisements were inserted in the newspapers, inviting persons opposed to the Act to come to an Assembly on Friday, June 2, 1730, in St. George's Fields, "all wearing blue cockades."[15] The intention was, of course, to prove the reality of Lord Gordon's constituency, or backing, in this matter, for the so-called "Protestant Association" had hitherto existed only on paper. And in the very circumstances of the assembly of the forty thousand people, we find the first incongruity, the first lack of forethought—I cannot call it malicious intent—in the fact that, though the magistrates of London, Southwark and Westminster were invited to attend to "overawe and control any riotous or evil-minded persons,"[16] yet "the people were to assemble on a spot where none of these magistrates had power to act."[17] This was the first mistake.

I said "first" because there were others, three other prime mistakes, which I shall point out as we go along with the narrative. I said "first mistake" because I believe that Lord Gordon was decent

---

[13] "Trial," p. 16.

[14] "Trial," p. 17.

[15] Gibbon wrote to his wife on June 8: "Forty thousand Puritans, such as they might be in the time of Cromwell, have started from their graves." ("Miscellaneous Works," ed. 1837, p. 299.) When Lord George Gordon arrived at 11 o'clock he found them singing hymns and marching.

[16] "Plain Account."

[17] "Trial," p. 20.

and sincere in his intentions. I believe what followed was a series of mistakes. He might have avoided much of the trouble by more careful planning, but it is too much to say that he intended the succeeding events. As Holcroft so sanely remarked, Gordon seemed "actuated rather by a wrong head than a wicked heart." The entire event, together with the manifesto about "civil and religious liberties" which I have given above, might well have been taken rather "in a ludicrous than a serious point of view"[18] were it not for the consequences. Mere fanaticism was followed by "domestic treason and foreign villainy," according to our "real friend to religion and Britain,"[19] who thought many of the rioters were "either in the interest or the pay of America, France and Spain." Holcroft mentioned the fact that some blamed the American colonies, and tells how some call the troublemakers "French Rioters," and urge:

> "If the French are suffered by these means to prevail, Popery will certainly be introduced, which we have no reason to fear from a British Parliament."[20]

I have said enough now to let my readers know that London went through a week of rioting which Dr. Johnson spoke of to Mrs. Thrale as "a time or terror."[21] Elsewhere Dr. Johnson said there was "an universal panic," though Horace Walpole said in a letter—which might have intended a calming effect: "I assure your Ladyship there is no panic. Lady Aylesbury has been at the play in the Haymarket, and the Duke and my four nieces at Ranelagh this evening."[22] Yet, at any rate, we seem to have everywhere indisputable evidence that violence was done. If the sworn testimony at the trial is not sufficient, I can at least quote again: "Several chapels have been destroyed, and several inoffensive Papists have been plundered; but the high sport was to burn the gaols."[23] And, panic or no panic, all the confusion and trouble, robbery, brutality, and incendiarism are to be blamed on three prime mistakes on the part of Lord George Gordon.

The clue to the first of these mistakes is to be found in a statement by the attorney general at the trial,[24] a statement substantiated by the evidence of the circulated hand-bills, by the contemporary newspapers, and by the witnesses examined and cross-examined

[18] "Plain Account."

[19] F. & T.

[20] "Plain Account." Benjamin Franklin (Mem. III., 62) is supposed to have slyly commented on the burning of Lord Mansfield's house, that he who advocated the burning of American houses "has had fire brought home to him."

[21] Boswell, Vol. III., p. 429.

[22] Letters, Vol. VII., p. 388.

[23] Boswell, Vol. III., p. 430.

[24] "Trial," p. 19.

at the bar. *"All that wore cockades were welcome."* That was the cause of all the trouble. To present a petition in due order, to march decently as a representative *Protestant Association,* to be respected for an organized and orderly expression of opinion,—all these became impossible as soon as laxity in organization rendered "all that wore cockades" welcome. The claim of a man to place in an honest and respectable and responsible demonstration was accepted as genuine as soon as he merely donned the blue cockade. Honesty and respectability mattered not at all; they were disregarded so long as "all that wore cockades were welcome." There was no organization,; no authority. There was no examination of credentials,—forty thousand were necessary; they must have the forty thousand,—there was no test of sincerity, a man did not even have to be known, he had only to wish to march. To the immense concourse—one witness had "never seen so many people together before"[25]—there came "some with serious intentions, some with wicked, and others out of curiosity."[26] *"All that wore cockades were welcome!"* Is it any wonder then that with such lack of organization there should be free scope, when once aroused, to the "intemperate fury of a few misguided zealots, assisted by those miscreants, who always mingle with the mob, whose trade is plunder, and who are, therefore, continually active where tumult and anarchy prevail"? Later a hand-bill had to be circulated, telling people not to wear blue cockades because they had been assumed by a "set of miscreants whose purpose it was to burn the city and plunder its inhabitants." But the mistake was made, the harm was done. And all because "all who wore cockades were welcome." Only when the significance of the blue cockade was abolished was Gibbon able to write to his wife at Bath, on 10th June, 1780: "This audacious tumult is perfectly quelled."[27] That was the first mistake.

The second mistake was the worst of all, because the most irretrievable. It also was almost unpardonable because it also might have been foreseen and avoided. From the testimony of two men, I take two phrases.[58] Lord Gordon may not have usedthe exact words at all; he may not have used the ideas in conjunction; but at least they show the temper of his mind that Friday morning at St. George's Fields, and indicated the impression his personality made on his hearers that day sufficiently clearly to enable us to understand that he had changed tactics when he called them "peaceable petitioners" while they stormed about the lobby of the House. Here are the phrases: *"He would not present the petition of a luke-warm*

[25] "Trial," p. 23.

[26] "Plain Account," p. 15.

[27] "Miscellaneous Works," ed. 1837, p. 299.

[28] "Trial," pp. 26, 27.

people." "He reminded them of the example of the Scotch." And the peaceableness of his attitude in the lobby of the house, where he called them his "peaceable petitioners," is somewhat belied by the fact that there he "again mentioned the conduct of the Scotch."[29] This is really very important. "The example of the Scotch!"—and what was the example of the Scotch? Rioting, devastation, incendiarism, and other such peaceful, petition-presenting means. The persistent return of this "example of the Scotch" in the testimony seems to fix the intention, or rather the blame, pretty thoroughly. "The example of the Scotch," indeed! And then he had the presumption to try to call himself a "peaceful petitioner!" Just at the point in the proceedings where there began to be doubt as to the success of the monster demonstration, when decent hope was willing to turn to frantic despair, he came out on the balcony in the lobby and reminded them of the success the year before in a similar cause, of rioting, of mob-violence. He called to mind the "example of the Scotch," who had burned and wrecked, and so he incited his own "mob" to plunder. It was a crowning mistake at a critical moment.

The third mistake is also concerned with those fatal hours while the mob crowded about the Houses of Parliament. A certain Rev. Thomas Bowen said on the witness stand that, when the people refused to quit the lobby he "spoke a few words and told them that they hindered their own business," and he "heard a person in the lobby say, very distinctly, that if the prisoner [Lord Gordon] would come and say it was necessary for them to go, they would go."[30] The attorney general struck at the bottom of the case by saying: "The petition being presented, their legal purpose was answered; and if their intentions were decent, they should have retired."[31] As the solicitor general said: "A steady and firm petitioner is a new language; it is turning a petition into a demand."[32] Lord George Gordon, at whose call "all that wore cockades" had assembled, who was chiefly responsible for the forty thousand "peaceful petitioners,"—Lord George Gordon at this critical turn of events deserted the constitutional procedure of presenting a petition, and then returning home; he turned a request into a demand; he cast his influence on the side of violence when at this important moment he abandoned legal procedure and acknowledged right and reminded his people of the "example of the Scotch." The first mistake was

[29] This is proven by several testimonies by several different witnesses. It seems to contradict that later testimony which said he "never made use of one inflammatory expression." ("Trial," p. 57.

[30] "Trial," p. 30.

[31] "Trial," p. 17.

[32] "Trial," p. 76.

the admission of unruly members, the second mistake was the mention of Scotch violence, the third mistake was the tactical blunder of talking unruly measures to unruly members at the very moment when he should have asked them to disperse. It was a case of doing the wrong thing at the right time. This was the supreme mistake. It was not such a fundamental one, nor one so easily to be foreseen and avoided as the other two; but it was the culminating error which set loose all the blind, immeasurable flood of impotent rage and irreponsible ruination.

The crowd soon began to exercise the most arbitrary and dictatorial power of the Lords and Commons. I quote a passage from Holcroft's *Plain Account:*

"But however peaceable and well disposed some of them might be, it was very evident, from the habit and appearance of numbers amongst them, that order and regularity were not long to be expected from such an assembly; on the contrary, they soon began to exercise the most arbitrary and dictatorial power over both Lords and Commons. They obliged almost all the members to put blue cockades in their hats, and call out, 'No Popery.' Some they compelled to take oaths to vote for the repeal of the obnoxious act, and others they insulted in the most indecent and violent manner. They took possession of all the avenues from the outer door to the very door of the House of Commons, which they twice attempted to force open. The like attempt was made at the House of Lords; but by the exertion of the door-keepers, and the care of Sir Francis Molyneux, it did not succeed. The Archbishop of York was one of the first they attacked. As soon as his coach was known coming down Parliament street, he was saluted with hisses, groans, and hootings; and when he got out of his carriage, to avoid greater mischief, was obliged to say (which he did in a pitiable and enfeebled voice), "No Popery, No Popery!" The Lord President of the council, Lord Bathurst, they pushed about in the rudest manner and kicked violently in the legs. Lord Mansfield had the glasses of his carriage broken, the panels beat in, and narrowly escaped with his life. The Duke of Northumberland was exceedingly ill-treated, and had his pocket picked of his watch. The Bishop of Litchfield had his gown torn. The wheels of the Bishop of Lincoln's carriage were taken off, and his lordship might be said to escape personal injury almost by miracle."

A week of disgraceful rioting followed. Many houses were torn down or burned, first chapels, then the homes of Catholics, then the houses of the marshal's constables and justices who had tried to interfere.[33] And so "the good Protestants," to use the words of

[33] "Trial," pp. 36-38.

Dr. Johnson,[34] tendered insults to the Lords and the Commons, "who bore it with great tameness"; and mob-violence being once in vogue, there was trouble in checking it. The "mob, raging and roaring in the lobby," was confronted by soldiers. General Conway proposed a military defence. Colonel Gordon threatened to use his word on Lord George if the "rascally adherents of the latter attempted entry." Finally Justice Addington sent the cavalry away and the mob dispersed. But then the trouble began.

Following "the example of the Scotch," part of the paraders proceeded to demolish various Catholic chapels in Duke street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Warwick street, and Golder's Square. Thirteen men were taken by the "military" and the next day, Saturday, 3d June, the trouble "partly subsided." But on Sunday rioting broke out afresh. Chapels and dwelling houses of Catholics in and about Moorfields were attacked. Here is a characteristic incident:

> "They stripped the house of furniture and the chapel not only of the ornaments and insignia of religion, but tore up the altars, pulpits, pews and benches, and made huge fires of them, leaving nothing but the bare walls, and in many places not even them. They publicly avowed their intention to root out Papery, to release those who had been confined in Newgate for their proceedings at the Sardinian and Warwick Street Chapels on Friday; to pull down the houses of the justices who committed them, and the persons who gave evidence against them."

The ill-work continued. Newgate was attacked and burned on Tuesday. On Wednesday, three boys went down Holborn in the middle of the day extorting money; shops were shut, blue silk was displayed on most of the houses and the words "No Popery" were chalked on doorways. A Protestant minister (the Rev. Allen) was openly robbed; a man with a blue cockade and a bludgeon was demanding money in Bedford row.[35] A mere boy of fifteen was found destroying houses in Oxford road; a certain William Brown was indicted for "entering the dwelling house of Francis Deacon, cheesemonger, and holding a large knife in his hand, making use of the following words: 'Damn your eyes, if you do not give me a shilling directly, I'll bring a mob that will pull down your house about your ears.'"[36] A mere chimney sweep, sixteen years old, was found dead with forty guineas on his person.[37] Dr. Johnson wrote to Mrs. Thrale:[38] "On Wednesday (June 7) . . . as I went by, the

[34] Boswell, Vol. III., p. 428.
[35] These facts from "Plain Account."
[36] "Annual Register," 1780; "Chronicle," p. 271ff.
[37] "Plain Account."
[38] "Trial," p. 18.

Protestants were plundering the Sessions-House at the Old Bailey. There were not, I believe, a hundred; but they did their work at leisure, in full security without sentinels, without trepidation, as men lawfully employed, in full day." Another move of the mob was still more terrible: It was an attack upon the national credit—a whole people's property—an attack upon the bank.[39] This turn of affairs was dangerous. It was obviously dangerous to the public security; it was also dangerous to the rioters. However unaffected, even perhaps acquiescent, Protestant Britain might have been to the demolition of Catholic churches, there could be no toleration among these stolid, conservative folk for an attack upon a respected and important British institution. This amounted to treason.

The testimony of one James Lucy is interesting:[40]

> "I was in Palace yard on the evening of Tuesday. There was a great mob who had blue cockades in their hats. They cried out, 'No Popery,' and had three flags with them. One James Jackson carried one of the flags; he waved it, and called out, 'To Hyde's,[41] hoa; destroy his house for ordering the horse in amongst us.' I went to Hyde's house, and saw the same Jackson there with the flag. Goods were thrown out of the house and burnt, and the inside pulled to pieces. The same man afterwards called out, 'Hoa for Newgate, and let out the prisoners.' I saw the mob and him there with the flag."

This James Jackson was executed.[42] The cry had been raised: "Go to the Bank, there is a million of money to pay you for your pains!" British magistrates, British law, the British nation were now being attacked. As I said, this amounted to treason. It is no wonder, then, that the rioters as well as the bystanders were in danger. The King said in council "that the magistrates had not done their duty, but that he would do his own."[43] And so, by very vigorous and forceful martial measures, the rioting was suppressed and peace eventually restored.

And now where should the blame lie?

Was it true, as Gibbon said on the sixth of June, that "the old story of religion had raised most *formidable* tumults in this town?"[44] Lord Chief Justice Loughborough said in his charge to a special commission on July 10 at at St. Margaret's Hill:

---

[39] June 9, Boswell, Vol. III., p. 429.

[40] "Trial," p. 39.

[41] Hyde was Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, who had called out the military. His testimony ("Trial," pp. 37-8) is very illuminating.

[42] "Annual Register," 1780; "Chronicle," p. 271.

[43] Boswell, Vol. III., p. 429.

[44] "Miscellaneous Works," ed. 1837, p. 299.

> "In four days, by the incredible activity of this band of furies parading the streets of the metropolis with flaming torches, seventy-two private houses, and four public gaols[45] were destroyed, one of them the county gaol, and that built in such a manner as to justify the idea that it was impregnable to armed force. Religion . . . was made the profane pretext for assaulting the government and trampling upon the laws of the country."[46]

It seems to me that this is true, that the Protestant religion was made a pretext by "a set of miscreants." We must remember that "all who wore cockades were welcome"; and it was an easy thing to put a bit of blue in your hat. So robbery stalked about under the banner of pretended religious liberty. When a certain George Barton was led in to trial for an assault committed in Holborn, he sought to make use of the pretext by saying aloud in court: "Pray, remember the Protestant religion."[47] It was in the name of Protestantism that chapels were destroyed, houses burned, magistrates resisted, and Newgate and the Bank attacked. A curious satirical poem of the time, entitled *The Flames of Newgate,*[48] contained the following lines:

> "Now Pop'ry stirring a diverting fray,
> Religion's awful subject comes in play;
> Behold upon his legs Lord *Hudibras:*
> Another Bill in peace he would let pass;
> But in religious matters over-nice
> He argues that in Freedom's Paradise;
> The thorny weed of Rome without dispute
> Should be mark'd down as the *forbidden fruit.*
> * * *
> His eery dream, the moment he reveals,
> The lawless multitude crowd at his heels.
> Each son of Mischief now adorns his head,
> Like *Cain* with a distinguishing cockade:
> See knaves and fools all jumbled in one mass,
> And hear the sermon of Lord *Hudibras.*
> * * *
> At last to Newgate, a fallacious hope,
> Drives the fanatic throng to seek the *Pope.*

This is biting satire and it shows some of the tumbling confusion and glaring incongruities of the event.

If religion was used as a pretext by the lawless, it was also used as a pretext by the bystanders. Holcroft says:[49] "All ranks of

[45] The neglect to mention the Catholic churches seems to substantiate my opinion that officialdom acted in defense of national and individual British property and not with much thought of Catholic property.

[46] "Annual Register," 1780; "Chronicle," p. 271ff.

[47] "Annual Register," 1780; "Chronicle," p. 271.

[48] London: Printed for J. Southern, Bookseller, MDCCLXXXII.

people began to be exceedingly terrified at the lawless proceedings of this day (Monday, June 5); and numbers put blue cockades in their hats (although it might now be said to be the ensign of rebellion), on purpose to avoid personal injury . . . . The very Jews in Houndsditch and Duke's Place followed the general example and gave an air of ridicule to what they understood in a very serious light, by writing on their shutters, *This house is a true Protestant.*"

This reckless and widespread assumption of the blue cockade had much to do with all the trouble, and after the hand-bill requested its discardal, quiet was restored. Witnesses said[50] that the people in Palace-yard "appeared to be a different sort of people, and a lower sort" than had assembled at St. George's Fields, that they were "chiefly led," "many of them were in liquor," the persons who made the disturbances "were not friends" to the Protestant cause, the people who pulled the wheels off the Bishop of Lincoln's carriage "had not cockades," that, with respect to the lobby "there were other persons in the place beside the Protestant Association," and that those who assembled in St. George's Fields "had no weapons" and it was not purposed to march on Parliament in a body. One witness said that he was at Westminster Bridge: "I spoke to one man, and asked him, if he was of the association? His answer was, 'No, by God, this is my association,' showing a great club."[51] And the trouble was that the blue cockade was easily transferred as an emblem from one association to another. I believe, with the attorney for Lord Gordon, Mr. Kenyon, that the Lord "could have no interest in anarchy and confusion, nor could he from any common principle of human action, wish to introduce rebellion and revolt." Lord Gordon's chief fault lay in failing to provide against trouble, not so much in wishing to cause trouble. "All that wore cockades were welcome!"

All the monster demonstrations, the torchlight processions, the "marching tradesmen" of the Chartist movement at which the conservative Duke of Wellington shuddered were conducted decently and in order. In the first place, there was no incitement to violence; in the second place, they dispersed almost immediately their petitions were presented; in the third place, they were organized, vouched for, and controlled by responsible organizations. The disasters brought about by the Protestant Association were due to violation of these three conditions, especially the last. The Protestant Association had been assembled for the first time as a body; there was no controlling administrative authority, and the whole project was too great for a

---

49 "Plain Account."

50 "Trial," pp. 36, 44, 61, 62, 63.

51 "Trial," p. 45.

young and formless organization. Entirely aside from the question of the intention of violence which the prosecutors were not able to prove, entirely aside from the misplaced emphasis on "religious liberty," entirely aside from the assumed justice of the claims, the whole movement was at fault because "all who wore cockades were welcome" and because public religious "demonstrations" are ever inclined to be violently emotional rather than clear and sensible. It is sad, but true, that "in nothing have men lost their reason so much as in their religion." It is also true that mobs are unreasonable. Religion, in addition, has nothing to do with force of numbers. Religion is an individual matter between the individual soul and God. Its rights and wrongs should be presented and discussed by an individual and not by a mob. A single clear head can reason; a thousand heads acting simultaneously merely rave. That is why Lord Gordon should have presented his petition alone—backed by the clear signatures and not by the excitable persons of his Protestant supporters. That is why we should not convert with fire and sword as Cromwell tried to do, but by a capable missionary representative. That is why Wat Tyler failed where continual parliamentary agitation succeeded. That is why the Jacobins fell where Napoleon was able to stand. That is why Alexander's empire melted and Grecian culture endured. A man or an idea may persuade where a thousand men in arms may not. Again I say, religion is an individualistic thing and must not be urged as an issue by military or political force of numbers.

As we look back upon the Gordon riots today, we must not judge the eighteenth century by the facts of the twentieth. But we may learn—as all history ought to teach us—to avoid present error by past mistakes. In all religious affairs we should not count on force of numbers, we should not be lax in organization, we should never urge or suggest violence.

Elbridge Colby.

New York, N. Y.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI BENEDICTI DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XV.

AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES ARCHIEPISCOPOS EPISCOPOS ALIOSQVE LOCORVM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

Venerablies Fratres, salvtem et apostolicam benedictionem:

AD beatissimi Apostolorum Principis cathedram arcano Dei providentis consilio, nullis Nostris meritis, ubi provecti sumus, cum quidem Christus Dominus ea ipsa Nos voce, qua Petrum, appellaret, "pasce agnos meos, pasce oves meas" (Ioan xxi., 15-17); continuo Nos summa cum benevolentiae caritate oculos in gregem, qui Nostrae mandabatur curae, convertimus; innumerabilem sane gregem, ut qui universos homines, alios alia ratione, complectatur. Omnes enim, quotquot sunt, Iesus Christus a peccati servitute, profuso in pretium suo sanguine, liberavit; nec vero est ullus, qui a beneficiis redemptionis huius exceptione excludatur: itaque genus humanum divinus Pastor partim Ecclesiae suae caulis iam feliciter inclusum habet, partim se eodem compulsurum amantissime affirmat: "Et alias oves habeo, quae non sunt ex hoc ovili: et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient." (Ioan x., 16.) Equidem non vos hoc celabimus, Venerabiles Fratres: ante omnia, divina certe benignitate excitatum, sensimus in animo incredibilem quemdam studii et amoris impetum ad cunctorum salutem hominum quaerendam; atque illud ipsum fuit Nostrum in Pontificatu suscipiendo votum, quod Iesu, mox crucem subeuntis, fuerat: "Pater sancte, serva eos in nomine tuo, quos dedisti mihi." (Ioan xvii., 11.)

Iam vero, ut primum licuit ex hac arce Apostolicae dignitatis rerum humanarum cursum uno quasi obtutu contemplari, cum lacrimabilis obversaretur Nobis ante oculos civilis societatis conditio, acri sane dolore affecti sumus. Quo enim pacto fieret ut Nostrum communis omnium Patris animum non vehementissime sollicitaret hoc Europae atque adeo orbis terrae spectaculum, quo nullum fortasse nec atrocius post hominum memoriam fuit, nec luctuosius? Omnino illi advenisse dies videntur, de quibus Christus praenuntiavit: "Audituri . . . estis praelia, et opiniones praeliorum. . . . Consurget enim gens in gentem, et regnum in regnum." (Matth. xxiv., 6, 7.) Tristissima usquequaque dominatur

imago belli; nec fere nunc est aliud quod hominum cogitationes occupet. Maximae sunt praestantissimaeque opulentia gentes quae dimicant: quamobrem quid mirum, si horrificis bene instructae praesidiis, quae novissime ars militaris invenit, conficere se mutuo exquisita quadam immanitate contendant? Nec ruinarum igitur nec caedis modus: quotidie novo redundat cruore terra, ac sauciis completur exanimisque corporibus. Num, quos ita videris alteros alteris infestos, eos dixeris ab uno omnes prognatos, num eiusdem naturae, eiusdem societatis humanae participes? Num fratres agnoveris, quorum unus est Pater in caelis? Dum autem infinitis utrimque copiis furiose decernitur, interea doloribus et miseriis, quae bellis, tristis cohors, comitari solent, civitates, domus, singuli premuntur: crescit immensum in dies viduarum orborumque numerus; languent, interceptis itineribus, commercia; vacant agri; silent artes; in angustiis locupletes, in squallore inopes, in luctu sunt omnes.

Hisce Nos tam extremis rebus permoti, in primo tamquam limine Pontificatus maximi, Nostrarum partium esse duximus, suprema illa Decessoris Nostri, praeclarae sanctissimaeque memoriae Pontificis, revocare verba, iisque iterandis, Apostolicum officium auspicari; vehementerque eos, quit res regunt vel gubernant publicas, obsecravimus, ut, respicientes quantum effusum iam esset lacrimarum et sanguinis, alma pacis munera reddere populis maturarent. Atque utinam, Dei miserentis beneficio, fiat, ut, quem Angeli in ortu divine hominum Redemptoris faustum cecinere nuntium, idem, ineuntibus Nobis vicarium Ipsius munus, celeriter insonet: "In terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis." (Luc. ii., 14.) Audiant Nos ii, rogamus, quorum in manibus fortuna civitatum sita est. Aliae profecto adsunt viae, rationes aliae, quibus, si qua sunt violata iura, saciri possint. Has, positis interim armis, bona experiantur fide animisque volentibus. Ipsorum Nos universarumque gentium amore impulsi, nulla Nostra causa, sic loquimur. Ne sinant igitur hanc amici et patris vocem in irritum cadere.

At vero, non solum huius cruenti dimicatio belli miserrimos habet populos, Nosque anxios et sollicitos. Alterum est, in ipsis medullis humanae societatis inhaerens, furiale malum; idque omnibus, quicumque sapiunt, est formidini, utpote quod, cum alia iam attulerit et allaturum sit detrimenta civitatibus, tum huius luctouissimi belli semen iure habeatur. Etenim ex quo christianae sapientiae praecepta atque instituta observari desita sunt in disciplina rei publicae, cum stabilitatem tranquillitatemque ordinis illa ipsa continerent, necessario nutare funditus coeperunt civitates, ac talis et mentium conversio et morum demutatio consecuta

est, ut, nisi, Deus mature adiuvet, impendere iam humanae consortionis videatur exitium. Itaque haec cernimus: abesse ab hominum cum hominibus coniunctione benevolentiam mutuam; despicatui haberi eorum qui praesunt, auctoritatem; ordines cum ordinibus civium iniuriose contendere; fluxa et caduca ita sitienter appeti bona, quasi non alia sint, eaque multo potiora, homini proposita ad comparandum, His quidem quatuor capitibus causas totidem contineri arbitramur, cur societas humani generis adeo graviter perturbetur. Danda igitur communiter est opera, ut pellantur e medio, christianis nimirum principiis revocandis, si vere consilium est pacare communes res recteque componere.

Ac primum Christus Dominus, cum hanc ipsam ob causam de caelis descendisset, ut, quod invidia diaboli eversum fuerat, restitueret in hominibus regnum pacis, non alio illud voluit niti fundamento, nisi caritatis. Quare haec saepius: "Mandatum novum do vobis: ut diligatis invicem" (Ioan xiii., 34); "Hoc est praeceptum meum, ut diligatis invicem" (Ioan xv., 12); "Haec mando vobis ut diligatis invicem" (Ioan xv., 17): tamquam si unum hoc suum esset officium et munus, adducere homines ut diligerent inter se. Atque huius rei gratia, quod non adhibuit argumentorum genus? Suspicere in caelum nos omnes iubet: "Unus est enim Pater vester, qui in caelis est." (Matth. xxiii., 9.) Omnes, nullo nationis aut linguae aut rationum discrimine, eamdem docet formulam precandi: "Pater Noster, qui es in caelis" (Matth. vi., 9); quin etiam affirmat Patrem caelestem, in beneficiis naturae dilargiendis, ne merita quidem singulorum discernere: "Qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos; et pluit super iustos et iniustos." (Matth. v., 45.) Fratres etiam nos tum dicit inter nos esse, tum suos appellat: "Omnes autem vos fratres estis." (Matth. xxiii., 8.) "Ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus." (Rom. viii., 29.) Quod vero ad fraternum amorem excitandum, vel erga eos quos naturae superbia contemnit, valet plurimum, in infimo quoque suae ipse vult agnosci personae dignitatem: "Quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis." (Matth. xxv., 40.) Quid, quod sub exitum vitae impensissime rogavit Patrem, ut quotquot in se ipsum essent credituri, omnes caritatis copulatione essent unum? "Sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te." (Ioan xvii., 21.) Denique e cruce penden, suum sanguinem in nos omnes exhausit, unde quasi coagulati compactique in unum corpus, sic amaremus inter nos, quemadmodum inter membra eiusdem corporis summa amicitia est.—Verum longe aliter se habent mores horum temporum. Nunquam fortasse fraternitatis humanae tanta fuit, quanta hodie, praedicatio; quin imo non dubitant, Evangelii voce neglecta, operaque Christi et Ecclesiae posthabita, hoc fraternitatis studium

efferre, tamquam unum e maximis muneribus, quae huius aetatis humanitas pepereit. Re tamen vera, numquam minus fraterne actum est inter homines, quam nunc. Crudelissima ob dissimilitudines generis sunt odia; gentem a gente potius simultates, quam regiones separant; eadem in civitate, eadem intra moenia flagrant mutua invidia ordines civium; inter privatos autem omnia amore sui, tamquam suprema lege, diriguntur.

Videtis, Venerabiles Fratres, quam necesse sit omni studio eniti, ut Iesu Christi caritas rursus in hominibus dominetur. Hoc certe semper Nobis propositum habituri sumus, velut proprium Nostri Pontificatus opus; hoc ipsum studete vos, hortamur. Ne desistamus vel inculcare auribus hominum vel re praestare illud Ioannis: "Diligamus alterutrum." (I. Ioan iii., 23.) Praeclara certe, valdeque commendanda sunt illa, quibus haec aetas abundat beneficentiae causa institutis; at enim, si quid ad veram Dei et aliorum caritatem in animis fovendam conferant, tum demum solidae utilitatis sunt: quod si nihil eo conferant, nulla sunt; nam "qui non diligit, manet in morte." (Ibid. 14.)

Alteram diximus communis perturbationis causam in eo consistere, quod iam non sancta vulgo sit eorum qui cum potestate praesunt, auctoritas. Ex quo enim placuit omnis humanae potestatis non a Deo, rerum conditore et dominatore, sed a libera hominum voluntate deducere originem, vincula officii, quae eos inter qui praesunt et qui subsunt, intercedere debeant, adeo extenuata sunt, ut propemodum evanuisse videantur. Immodicum enim studium libertatis cum contumacia coniunctum, paullatim usquequaque pervasit, idque ne domesticam quidem societatem, cuius potestatem luce clarius est a natura proficisci, intactam reliquit; quin etiam, quod magis dolendum est, in sacros usque recessus penetravit. Hinc contemptio nascitur legum; hinc motus multitudinum; hinc petulantia reprehendendi quidquid iussum sit; hinc sexcentae repertae viae ad disciplinae nervos elidendos; hinc immania illorum facinora, qui, quum se nulla teneri lege profiteantur, nec fortunas hominum verentur nec vitam perdere.

Ad hanc opinandi agendique pravitatem, qua societatis humanae constitutio pervertitur, Nobis quidem, quibus magisterium veritatis divinitus mandatum est, tacere non licet; populosque admonemus illius doctrinae, quam nulla hominum placita mutare possunt: "Non est potestas nisi a Deo: quae autem sunt, a Deo ordinatae sunt." (Rom. xiii., 1.) Quisquis igitur inter homines praeest, sive is princeps est sive infra principatum, eius divina est origo auctoritatis. Quare Paulus non quovis modo, sed religiose, id est ex conscientiae officio, obtemperandum iis esse edicit, qui pro potestate iubent, nisi quid iubeant divinis contrarium legibus:

"Ideo necessitate subditi estote, non solum propter iram, sed etiam propter conscientiam." (Ibid 5.) Congruit cum verbis Pauli, quod ipse Apostolorum Princeps docet: "Subiecti igitur estote omni humanae creaturae propter Deum: sive regi, quasi praecellenti: sive ducibus, tamquam ab eo missis. . . ." (I. Petr. ii., 13-14.) Ex quo idem Gentium Apostolus colligit, eum qui homini legitime imperanti contumax obsistat, Deo obsistere ac sempiternas sibi parare poenas: "Itaque qui resistit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit. Qui autem resistunt, ipsi sibi damnationem acquirunt." (Rom. xiii., 2.)

Meminerint hoc Principes rectoresque populorum, ac videant num prudens ac salutare consilium cum potestati publicae tum civitatibus sit a sancta Iesus Christi religione discedere, a qua tantum ipsa potestas habet roboris et firmamenti. Etiam atque etiam considerent, num doctrinam Evangelii et Ecclesiae velle a disciplina civitatis, a publica iuventutis institutione exclusam, civilis sapientiae sit. Nimis experiendo cognitum est, ibi hominum iacere auctoritatem, unde exsulet religio. Quod enim primo nostri generis parenti, cum officium deseruisset, contigit, idem civitatibus usu venire solet. Ut in illo, vix voluntas a Deo defecerat, effrenatae cupidines voluntatis repudiarunt imperium; ita ubi qui res moderantur populorum, divinam contemnunt auctoritatem, ipsorum auctoritati illudere populi consueverunt. Relinquitur sane, quod assolet, ut ad turbidos motus comprimendos vis adhibeatur; sed quo tandem fructu? Vi corpora quidem, non animi comprimuntur.

Sublata igitur aut debilitata illa duplici coniunctione, unde efficitur ut omne societatis corpus cohaereat, id est vel membrorum cum membris ob caritatem mutuam, vel eorundem cum capite ob auctoritatis obsequium, quisnam iure miretur, Venerabiles Fratres, hanc hominum societatem dispertitam in duas tamquam acies videri, quae inter se acriter et assidue digladientur? Stant contra eos quibus aliquam honorum copiam aut fortuna tribuit aut peperit industria, proletarii et opifices, propterea flagrantes malevolentia, quod cum eamdem naturam participent, non tamen in eadem, ac ipsi, conditione versentur. Scilicet, ut semel infatuati sunt concitatorum fallaciis, quorum ad nutum solent se totos fingere, quis eis persuadeat, non ex eo, quod homines sunt pares natura, sequi ut parem omnes obtinere debeant in communitate locum, sed eam esse singulorum conditionem, quam sibi quisque suis moribus, nisi res obstiterint, comparavit? Ita, qui tenuiores cum copiosis depugnant, quasi alienas hi bonorum partes occuparint, non contra iustitiam caritatemque tantum, verum etiam contra rationem faciunt, praesertim cum et ipsi possint honesta laboris

contentione meliorem sibi fortunam quaerere, si velint.—Quae vero quantaque hoc invidiosum certamen ordinum tum singulis tum communitati civium gignat incommoda, dicere nil attinet. Videmus omnes deploramusque crebas cessationes ab opere, quibus civilis publicaeque vitae cursus in ministeriis etiam apprime necessariis repente inhiberi solet: item minaces turbas et tumultus, in quibus non raro accidit, ut armis res geratur et humanus effluat cruor.

Non hic videtur Nobis argumenta repetere, quibus Socialistarum aliorumque in hoc genere errores manifesto convincuntur. Egit hoc ipsum sapientissime Leo XIII. Decessor Noster in Encyclicis Litteris sane memorandis: vosque, Venerabiles Fratres, pro vestra diligentia curabitis, ut gravissima illa praecepta ne unquam oblivioni dentur, imo in consociationibus ac coetibus catholicorum, in sacris concionibus, in publicis nostrorum scriptis illustrentur docte atque inculcentur, quandocumque res postulaverit. Sed potissimum—neque enim hoc iterare dubitamus—omni argumentorum ope, quae vel Evangelium, vel ipsa hominis natura, vel publicae privataeque disciplinae ratio suppeditat, studeamus hortari omnes, ut, ex divina caritatis lege, fraternis animis inter se diligant. Cuius quidem amoris non ea certe vis est, ut conditionum, ideoque ordinum distinctionem amoveat—quod non magis potest fieri, quam ut in corpore animantis una eademque membrorum omnium actio sit ac dignitas—sed tamen efficiet, ut qui loco superiores sunt, demittant se quodammodo ad inferiores: et non solum iuste adversus eos, quod par est, sed benigne, comiter, patienter sese gerant; hi autem illorum et laetentur prosperitate et confidant auxilio; sic prorsus, uti ex familiae eiusdem filiis minor natu maioris patrocinio praesidioque nititur.

At enim, Venerabiles Fratres, quae hactenus deplorando persecuti sumus, ea radicem habent altiorem: ac, nisi ad ipsam evellendam studia bonorum incumbant, illud profecto, quod est in votis, id est rerum humanarum stabilis et mansura tranquillitas, non sequatur. Ea quae sit, monstrat Apostolus: "Radix: . . . omnium malorum est cupiditas." (I. Tim. vi., 10.) Etenim, si quis recte consideret, mala, quibus nunc aegrotat humana societas, ex hac stirpe oriuntur omnia. Quandoquidem et perversitate scholarum, quibus aetatula cerea fingitur, et improbitate scriptorum, quibus, quotidie aut per intervalla, imperitae multitudinis mens formatur, et aliarum causa rerum, ad quas opinio popularis exigitur, quando, inquimus, ille infusus est animis perniciosissimus error, non sperandum esse homini sempiternum aevum in quo beatus sit; hic, hic licere ei esse beato, divitiis, honoribus, voluptatibus huius vitae fruendis; nemo mirabitur hos homines, natura factos ad beatitatem, ea vi qua ad eorum adeptionem bonorum

rapiuntur, eadem quicquid sibi moram in hac re aut impedimentum fecerit, repellere. Quoniam vero haec bona non aequaliter dispertita sunt in singulos, et quia socialis auctoritatis est prohibere, ne singulorum libertas fines excedat alienumque occupet, idcirco et odio habetur auctoritas, et miserorum in fortunatos ardet invidia, et inter ordines civium mutua contentione certatur, nitentibus quidem aliis attingere id quovis pacto et eripere quo carent, aliis autem retinere quod habent, atque etiam augere.

Hoc ipsum Christus Dominus cum prospiceret futurum, in divinissimo illo sermone, quem in monte habuit, terrestres nominis beatitudines quae essent, data opera explicavit: in quo christianae philosophiae quodammodo fundamenta posuisse dicendus est. Quae quidem vel hominibus perquam alienis a Fide singularem sapientiam et absolutissimam de religione ac moribus doctrinam continere visa sunt: et certe consentiunt omnes neminem ante Christum, qui ipsa est veritas, nec similiter eadem de re, nec pari gravitate ac pondere, nec tanto cum sensu amoris unquam praecepisse.

Iam divinae huius philosophiae illa intima et recondita ratio est, quod quae mortalis vitae appellantur bona, speciem quidem boni habent, vim non habent; ideoque non sunt ea, quibus fruens, homo beate possit vivere. Deo enim auctore, tantum abest ut opes, gloria, voluptas beatitatem afferant homini, ut, si vere hac potiri velit, debeat iis omnibus, Dei ipsius causa, carere: "Beati pauperes. . . . Beati, qui nunc fletis. . . . Beati eritis cum vos oderint homines, et cum separaverint vos, et exprobraverint, et eiecerint nomen vestrum tanquam malum." (Luc. vi., 20-22.) Scilicet per dolores, aerumnas, miserias vitae huius, si quidem ea toleremus ut oportet, aditum nobis ipsi patefacimus ad perfecta illa et immortalia bona, "quae praeparavit Deus iis, qui diligunt illum." (I. Cor. ii., 9.) Verum haec tanti momenti doctrina Fidei apud plurimos negligitur, apud multos penitus oblitterata videtur.— Atqui necesse est, Venerabiles Fratres, ad eam renovari omnium animos: non alio pacto homines et hominum societas conquiescent. Quicumque igitur quovis aerumnarum genere affliguntur, eos hortemur non oculos demittere in terram, qua peregrinamur, sed tollere ad caelum, quo tendimus: "Non enim habemus hic manentem civitatem, sed futuram inquirimus." (Heb. xiii., 13.) In mediis autem rerum acerbitatibus, quibus eorum periclitatur Deus in officio constantiam, saepe reputent, quid sibi paratum sit praemii, cum ex hoc periculo victores evaserint: "Id enim, quod in praesenti est momentaneum et leve tribulationis nostrae, supra modum in sublimitate aeternum gloriae pondus operatur in nobis." (II. Cor. iv., 17.) Denique omni ope atque opera eniti ut revirescat

in hominibus rerum fides quae supra naturam sunt, simulque cultus, desideratio, spes bonorum aeternorum, hoc debet esse vobis propositum in primis, Venerabiles Fratres, tum reliquo Clero, tum etiam nostris omnibus, qui, vario consociati foedere, Dei gloriam communemque veri nominis utilitatem student promovere. Prout enim haec apud homines Fides creverit, decrescet eorumdem studium immodicum consectandi terrestrium bonorum vanitatem, ac sensim, caritate resurgente, motus contentionesque sociales conticescent.

Nunc autem, si ab hominum communitate ad proprias Ecclesiae res considerandas cogitationem convertimus, est profecto, cur animus Noster, tam magna temporum calamitate percussus, aliqua saltem ex parte reficiatur. Nam, praeter argumenta, quae se dant apertissima, divinae illius virtutis ac firmitatis qua pollet Ecclesia, non parum consolationis ipsa Nobis offerunt, quae Decessor Noster Pius X., cum Sedem Apostolicam sanctissimae vitae exemplis illustrasset, praeclara Nobis reliquit suae actuosae providentiae munera. Videmus enim eius opera inflammatum universe in sacro ordine studium religionis; excitatam christiani populi pietatem; promotam in consociantionibus catholicorum actionem ac disciplinam; qua constitutas, qua numero auctas Episcoporum sedes; institutioni adolescentis Cleri tum pro severitate canonum, tum, quoad opus est, pro natura temporum consultum; a magisteriis sacrarum disciplinarum depulsa temerariae novitatis pericula; maiestati sacrorum artem musicam digne servire iussam auctumque liturgiae decus; novis praeconum Evangelii missionibus christianum late nomen propagatum.

Magna sunt ista quidem Decessoris in Ecclesiam promerita, quorum memoriam grate posteritas conservabit. Quoniam tamen ager Patrisfamilias semper, Deo permittente, inimici hominis malignitati patet, numquam est futurum, ut ibi elaborandum non sit, ne zizania luxuriantia bonis frugibus officiant. Itaque, interpretantes dictum quoque Nobis, quod prophetae Deus dixerat: "Ecce constituti te hodie super gentes et super regna, ut evellas et destruas . . . et aedifices et plantes" (Ierem. i., 10), quaecumque eront mala prohibenda, bona provehenda, quantum erit in Nobis, summo usque studio curabimus, quoad Pastorum Principi rationem a Nobis administrati muneris placeat repetere.

Iam nunc igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, cum vos universos primo litteris affamur, commodum videtur Nobis nonnulla attingere capita rerum quibus praecipaus quasdas curas adhibere decrevimus: ita, maturantibus vobis vestra opera adiuvare Nostram, maturius etiam optati fructus exsistent.

Principio, quoniam in omni hominum societate, quavis de causa

coiverint, ad successum communis causae maxime interest socios in idem summa conspiratione conniti, omnino Nobis faciendum est, ut dissensiones atque discordiae inter catholicos, quaecumque sunt, desinant esse; novae ne posthac oriantur; sed ii iam unum idemque omnes et sentiant et agant.—Probe Dei Ecclesiaeque hostes intelligunt, nostrorum quodvis in propugnando dissidium sibi esse victoriae: quare illam habent usitatissimam rationem, ut cum catholicos homines viderint coniunctiores, tum, callide iniicientes eis discordiarum semina, coniunctionem dirimere nitantur. Quae utinam ratio ne ita saepe ex voluntate eis evenisset, tanto cum religiosae rei detrimento! Itaque ubi potestas legitima quid certo praeceperit, nemini fas esto negligere praeceptum, propterea quia non probetur sibi: sed quod cuique videatur, id quisque subiiciat eius auctoritati, cui subest, eique, ex officii conscientia, pareat.—Item nemo privatus, vel libris diariisve vulgandis vel sermonibus publice habendis, se in Ecclesia pro magistro gerat. Norunt omnes cui sit a Deo magisterium Ecclesiae datum; huic igitur integrum ius esto pro arbitratu loqui, cum voluerit; ceterorum officium est, loquenti religiose obsequi dictoque audientes esse. In rebus autem, de quibus, salva fide et disciplina—cum Apostolicae Sedis iudicium non intercesserit—in utramque partem disputari potest, dicere quid sentiant idque defendere, sane nemini non licet. Sed ab his disputationibus omnis intemperantia sermonis absit, qua graves afferre potest offensiones caritati: suam quisque tueatur libere quidem, sed modeste sententiam; nec sibi putet fas esse, qui contrariam teneant, eos, hac ipsa tantum causa, vel suspectae fidei arguere vel non bonae disciplinae. Abstineant se etiam nostri, volumus, iis appellationibus, quae recens usurpari coeptae sunt ad catholicos a catholicis distinguendos: easque non modo devitent uti profanas vocum novitates, quae nec veritati congruunt nec aequitati; sed etiam quia inde magna inter catholicos perturbatio sequitur, magnaque confusio. Vis et natura catholicae fidei est eiusmodi, ut nihil et possit addi, nihil demi: aut omnis tenetur, aut omnis abiicitur. "Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit." (Symb. Athanas.) Non igitur opus est appositis ad professionem catholicam significandam; satis habeat unusquisque ita profiteri: "Christianus mihi nomen, catholicus cognomen"; tantum studeat se re vera eum esse, qui nominatur.

Ceterum, a nostris qui se ad communem rei catholicae utilitatem contulerunt, longe aliud nunc Ecclesia postulat, quam ut diutus haereant in quaestionibus, quibus nihil proficitur; postulat, ut summo opere contendant integram conservare fidem et incolumem ab omni erroris afflatu, sequentes eum maxime, quem Christus

constituit custodem et interpretem veritatis. Sunt etiam hodie, nec ita pauci sunt, qui, ut ait Apostolus, "prurientes auribus, cum sanam doctrinam non sustineant, ad sua desideria coacervent sibi magistros, et a veritate quidem auditum avertant, ad fabulas autem convertantur." (II. Tim., iv., 3, 4.) Inflati enim elatique magna opinione mentis humanae, quae progressiones sane incredibiles in exploratione naturae, Deo nimirum dante, fecit, nonnulli, cum prae suo iudicio auctoritatem Ecclesiae contemnerent, usque eo sua temeritate processerunt, ut ipsa Dei arcana et omnia quae Deus homini revelavit, sua intelligendi facultate metiri atque ad ingenium horum temporum accommodare non dubitarent. Itaque exstiterunt monstuosi errores Modernismi, quem recte Decessor Noster "omnium haereseon collectum," edixit esse et sollemniter condemnavit. Eam Nos igitur condemnationem, Venerabiles Fratres, quantacumque est, hic iteramus; et quoniam non usquequaque oppressa est tam pestifera lues, sed etiamnum hac illac, quamvis latenter, serpit, caveant omnes diligentissime, hortamur, a quavis huius contagione mali; de quo quidem apte affirmaveris quod Iob alia de re dixerat: "Ignis est usque ad perditionem devorans, et omnia eradicans genimina." (Iob xxxi., 12.) Nec vero tantum ab erroribus catholici homines, cupimus, abhorreant, sed ad ingenio etiam, seu spiritu, ut aiunt, Modernistarum: quo spiritu qui agitur, is quicquid sapiat vetustatem, fastidiose respuit, avide autem ubivis nova conquirit: in ratione loquendi de rebus divinis, in celebritate divine cultus, in catholicis institutis, in privata ipsa exercitatione pietatis. Ergo sanctam haberi volumus eam maiorum legem: Nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est; quae lex tametsi inviolate servanda est in rebus Fidei, tamen ad eius normam dirigenda sunt etiam, quae mutationem pati possunt; quamquam in his ea quoque regula plerumque valet: "Non nova, sed noviter."

Iam quia, Venerabiles Fratres, ad profitendam aperte fidem catholicam atque ad vivendum congruenter fidei, plurimum homines fraternis hortamentis mutuisque exemplis inflammari solent, ideo Nos alias atque alias excitari consociationes catholicorum equidem vehementer gaudemus. Atque illae non solum optamus ut crescant, sed volumus Nostro etiam patrocinio studioque semper floreant: florebunt autem, modo praescriptionibus quas haec Apostolica Sedes iam dedit vel datura eis est, constanter fideliterque obtemperarint. Quotquot igitur, earum participes societatum, pro Deo Ecclesiaque contendunt, ne sinant unquam sibi excidere quod Sapientia clamat: "Vir obediens loquetur victoriam" (Prov. xxi., 28); nisi enim Deo paruerint per obsequium in Ecclesiae ducem, nec divinam sibi conciliabunt opem, et frustra contendent.

Ad haec omnia vero—ut eum, quem exspectamus, exitum ha-

beant—nostis, Venerabiles Fratres, ilorum necessariam esse prudentem sedulamque operam, quos Christus Dominus operarios in messem suam misit, id est clericorum.—Quare intelligitis praecipuam vestram curam in hoc debere versari, ut et qui apud vos de sacro ordine iam sunt, in eis consentaneam sanctimoniam foveatis, et qui sunt alumni sacrorum, eos optimis institutis praeceptisque ad munus tam sanctum rite conformetis. Id vos quam diligentissime facere velitis—tametsi vestra diligentia hortatione non indiget—hortamur atque etiam obsecramus. Res enim eiusmodi agitur, ut nulla sit maioris momenti ad Ecclesiae bonum: qua de re, cum Decessores Nostri fel. rec. Leo XIII. et Pius X. egerint data opera. Nos hic plura dicere non habemus. Tantum rogamus, ut illa Pontificum sapientissimorum acta, praesertim Piana "Exhortatio ad Clerum," suadentibus atque instantibus vobis, ne unquam obruantur oblivione, sed studiosissime observentur.

Unum tamen est, quod praeteriri silentio non debet: quotquot enim sunt sacerdotes, omnes, uti filios Nobis penitus dilectos, volumus admonitos, quam plane opus sit, cum ad propriam ipsorum salutem, tum ad sacri ministerii fructum, eos quidem suo quemque Episcopo coniunctissimos esse, atque obsequentissimos. Profecto ab illa elatione animi et contumacia, quae horum est temporum, non omnes, ut supra deploravimus, vacant administri sacrorum: neque enim raro contingit Pastoribus Ecclesiae, ut dolorem et impugnationes inde inveniant, unde solatium et adiumentum iure exspectarint. Iam vero qui tam misere officium deserunt, etiam atque etiam recogitent, divinam esse eorum auctoritatem, quos "Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei" (Act xx., 28), ac si, ut vidimus, Deo resistunt, quicumque potestati cuivis legitimae resistunt, multo magis impie eos facere qui Episcopis, quos Deus suae potestatis sigillo consecraverit, parere abnuant. "Cum caritas," ita Ignatius Martyr, "non sinat me tacere de vobis, propterea anteverti vos admonere, ut unanimi sitis in sententia Dei. Etenim Iesus Christus, inseparabilis nostra vita, sententia Patris est, ut et Episcopi, per tractus terrae constituti, in sententia Patris sunt. Unde decet vos in Episcopi sententiam concurrere." (In Epist. ad Ephes., III.) Quemadmodum autem Martyr illustris, ita omnes, quotquot fuerunt, Patres et Doctores Ecclesiae locuti sunt.—Ad haec, nimis grave propter difficultates quoque temporum sacri Pastores ferunt onus; graviore etiam in sollicitudine sunt de gregis concrediti salute: "Ipsi enim pervigilant, quasi rationem pro animabus vestris reddituri." (Hebr. xiii., 17.) Nonne crudeles dicendi sunt, qui eis, obsequium debitum recusando, id oneris, id sollicitudinis augent? "Hoc enim non

expedit vobis" (Ibid. 17), diceret istis Apostolus: idque propterea quia "Ecclesia est plebs sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo grex adhaerens" (S. Cypr. "Florentio cui et Puppiano," p. 66, al. 69); ex quo sequitur, cum Ecclesia non esse, qui cum Episcopo non sit.

Et nunc, Venerabiles Fratres, in harum exitu litterarum, sponte redit animus ad illud, unde initium scribendi fecimus; atque huius calamitosissimi belli finem, tum societati hominum, tum Ecclesiae, iterum omnibus precibus imploramus; hominum quidem societati, ut, reconciliata cum fuerit pax, in omni civili et humano cultu vere progediatur: Ecclesiae autem Iesu Christi, ut, nullis iam impedimentis retardata, pergat in quavis ora ac parte terrarum opem et salutem hominibus afferre.—Ecclesia sane iam multo diutius non ea, qua opus habet, plena libertate fruitur; scilicet ex quo Caput eius Pontifex Romanus illo coepit carere praesidio, quod, divinae providentiae, nutu, labentibus saeculis nactus erat ad eamdem tuendam libertatem. Hoc autem sublato praesidio, non levis catholicorum turbatio, quod necesse erat fieri, secuta est: quicumque enim Romani Pontificis se filios profitentur, omnes, et qui prope sunt et qui procul, iure optimo exigunt ut nequeat dubitari, quin communis ipsorum Parens in administratione Apostolici muneris vere sit et prorsus appareat ab omni humana potestate liber. Itaque magnopere exoptantes ut pacem quamprimum gentes inter se componant, exoptamus etiam ut Ecclesiae Caput in hac desinat absona conditione versari, quae ipsi tranquillitati populorum, non uno nomine, vehementer nocet. Hac igitur super re, quas Decessores Nostri pluries expostulationes fecerunt, non quidem humanis rationibus, sed officii sanctitate adducti, ut videlicet iura ac dignitatem Sedis Apostolicae defenderent, easdem Nos iisdem de causis hic renovamus.

Restat, Venerabiles Fratres, ut, quoniam Principum eorumque omnium, qui possunt vel atrocitati vel incommoditati rerum, quas memoravimus, finem imponere, in manu Dei sunt voluntates, ad Deum suppliciter attollamus vocem, atque, universi generis humani nomine, clamemus: "Da pacem, Domine, in diebus nostris." Qui de se dixit: "Ego Dominus . . . faciens pacem." (Isai. xiv., 6-7.) Ipse tempestatum fluctus, quibus et civilis et religiosa societas iactatur, nostris conversus precibus ad benegnitatem, sedare celeriter velit. Adsit nobis propitia Virgo beatissima, quae ipsum genuit Principem pacis; ac Nostrae humilitatem Personae, Pontificale ministerium Nostrum, Ecclesiam atque adeo omnium animas hominum, divino Filii sui sanguine redemptas, in maternam suam fidem tutelamque recipiat.

Auspicem caelestium munerum ac testem benevolentiae Nostrae,

vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, vestroque Clero et populo apostolicam benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die festo Sanctorum omnium, I. Novembris MCMXIV., Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

BENEDICTVS PP. XV.

ENCYCLICAL OF HIS HOLINESS BENEDICT XV., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brethren, health and the apostolic benediction:

WHEN by the inscrutable design of Divine Providence, without any merit on our part, we were raised to the chair of the Blessed Prince of the Apostles, considering as addressed to ourselves in the same voice in which Our Lord spoke to St. Peter the words, "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep" (St. John xxi., 15-17), we immediately turned our eyes, with the deepest feeling of charity, to the flock entrusted to our care—an immense flock, in truth, because under one aspect or another it embraces all men. For all for whom Jesus Christ offered His blood as a price were freed by Him from the slavery of sin; no one is excluded from the benefits of this redemption. Wherefore the Divine Pastor states that whilst a part of the human race is already within the fold of His Church, He will lovingly compel the others to come in: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring and they shall hear My voice" (St. John x., 16). We shall not conceal from you, venerable brethern, that the first sentiment we experienced in our soul, and which was assuredly excited there by the Divine goodness, was a certain incredible impulse of zeal and love for the salvation of all men, and in accepting the pontificate we formed the same desire that Jesus Christ expressed when He was about to be crucified: "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me." (St. John xvii., 11.)

Now when from the height of this apostolic dignity we can, as if at one glance, contemplate the course of human events, and when we see before us the miserable condition of civil society we are affected with acute sorrow. And how could we, as the common father of all men, not be sorely troubled at the sight of Europe, and, indeed, of the whole world—the most terrible and most painful spectacle perhaps that has ever been presented in the course of history? Those days which Christ predicted seem in fact to have come: "You shall hear . . . of wars and rumors of wars. . . . For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." (Matt. xxiv., 6-7.) The fearful apparition of war is prominent

everywhere and nothing else engages men's attention. Great and flourishing nations are on the battlefields. Can we wonder that as they are well supplied with those horrible means of destruction which the military art has invented, they fight against one another with awful butchery? There is no limit to the ruin and slaughter; every day the earth is drenched with fresh blood and is covered with the wounded and the dead. And who would say that such men, armed one against the other, come from the same progenitor, that they are all possessed of the same nature and that all belong to the same human society? Who would take them to be brothers, the sons of one Father who is in heaven? Whilst on every side furious battles are being fought with vast forces, nations, families and individuals are oppressed by sorrow; day by day the number of widows and orphans increases immensely. Commerce languishes owing to the interruption of communications, the fields are empty, the arts are neglected, the rich are in poverty, the poor in squalor and all are in grief.

Moved by such grave evils, at the very first step as it were of the sovereign pontificate, we considered it our duty to recall the last words of our predecessor, a Pontiff of illustrious and holy memory, and to commence our apostolic ministry by repeating them, and so we warmly beseech rulers and governments to consider the tears and the blood already shed and to hasten to restore to the people the precious blessings of peace. May the merciful God grant that, as on the appearance of the Divine Redeemer upon the earth, so at the beginning of our duty as His Vicar the angels' voices may proclaim "Peace on earth to men of good will" (Luke ii., 14), and we pray that they may listen who have in their hands the destinies of States. Assuredly there are other ways and other methods by which justice can be done to injured rights. Let the belligerents, laying down their arms, have recourse to these, animated by good faith and intention. It is through love of them and of all nations and not from any motive of our own that we speak. Let them not, then, permit our friendly and paternal voice to be raised in vain.

But it is not merely the sanguinary war which darkens passions and troubles and embitters our spirit. There is another furious war which eats at the entrails of modern society—a war which terrifies every person of good sense, because whilst it has accumulated and will accumulate ruin amongst the nations, it contains in itself the seeds of the present disastrous struggle. From the moment when the rules and practices of Christian wisdom ceased to be observed in States—rules and practices which alone guarantee the stability and peace of institutions—these States necessarily began to tremble at their foundations, and there followed such a change in ideas and

customs that, if God does not soon intervene, it appears as if the dissolution of human society is at hand. The disorders that have arisen are the want of mutual love amongst men, contempt for authority, injustice in the relations between the different classes of society and material welfare made the only object of man's activity (as if there were not other and much more desirable blessings to be gained). These, in our opinion, are the four causes why human society is so greatly disturbed. It is necessary, then, that energy be exercised generally for the purpose of removing such disorders and restoring Christian principles, if the object is to put an end to discord and compose differences.

Jesus Christ came down from heaven in order to restore amongst men the reign of peace which had been troubled by the envy of Satan, and He desired to establish it on no other foundation than that of love. Hence the frequent use of these words: "A new commandment I give unto you: that you love one another" (John xiii., 34); "This is My commandment that you love one another" (John xv., 12); "These things I command you, that you love one another" (John xv., 17), as if all His mission and His work were restricted to making men love one another. And what powerful arguments did He not adopt for this purpose? He bids us all look up to heaven, "For One is your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. xxiii., 9). He teaches all without distinction of nation or tongue the same formula of prayer, "Our Father who art in heaven" (Matt. vi., 9). Nay, He assures us that this Heavenly Father in conferring benefits of nature does not even make distinction of merits: "Who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and the bad and raineth upon the just and the unjust" (Matt. v., 45). He declares, moreover, that we are all brothers, "And all you are brethren" (Matt. xxiii., 8), and His own brethren, "That He might be the first-born amongst many brethren" (Romans viii., 29). Then—a consideration which ought to stimulate us to fraternal love towards even those whom our native pride despises—He wishes that the dignity of His person should be recognized in the humblest. "As long as you did it to one of these, My least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matt. xxv., 40). And when about to leave this life He earnestly prayed the Father that all those who believed in Him should be one by the bond of charity, "As Thou Father in Me and I in Thee" (John xxvii., 21). Finally, He hung on the Cross and shed His blood for us all so that fashioned and formed in the one body we should love one another with that love which one member in the same body bears towards another.

But far otherwise do men act to-day. Never perhaps was human brotherhood more spoken of than at present; it is even pretended,

though the words of the Gospel and the work of Christ and His Church are forgotten, that this fraternal zeal is one of the most precious features of modern civilization. But the truth is that never was human fraternity so little practiced as it is to-day. Race hatred is most bitter. Nations are divided more by rancor than by natural boundaries. In one and the same country and within the walls of the same city different classes of the citizens hate one another, and amongst individuals everything is governed by selfishness as by a supreme law.

You see, venerable brethren, how necessary it is to make every effort so that the charity of Christ may prevail amongst men. This will certainly be our aim always as the special object of our pontificate. Let this also, we exhort you, be your work. We shall not grow weary of urging upon men to give effect to the teaching of the Apostle St. John, "Love one another" (I. St. John iii., 23). The pious institutions which abound in our time are certainly excellent and commendable, but they are only really advantageous when they tend in some way to foment in the hearts the love of God and of the neighbor; otherwise they have no value, because "He that loveth not abideth not in death" (I. John iii., 14).

We have stated that another cause of the general perturbation consists in this, that the authority of those who are in power is no longer respected. From the time when all human power sought to emancipate itself from God, the Creator and Father of the Universe, and to attribute its origin to man's free will, the bonds between superiors and inferiors have become so weak that they seem almost to have disappeared. An immoderate spirit of independence, combined with pride, has spread everywhere, invading even the family, whose authority so clearly arises from nature, and, what is more deplorable, it does not even stop at the steps of the sanctuary. Hence the contempt for laws, the insubordination of the masses, the saucy criticism of the commands of authority, the numerous ways discovered for eluding discipline and the frightful crimes of those who profess anarchy and do not hesitate to destroy the lives and properties of others.

In face of this criminal mode of thinking and acting by which the constitution of human society is perverted we, raised up by God to guard truth, cannot but lift our voice and remind the people of that doctrine which no human decree can change, "There is no power but from God and those that are ordained of God" (Romans xiii., 1). God, therefore, is the author of all power exercised on earth, whether it be sovereign power or subordinate authority. From this St. Paul derives the duty of obeying—not indeed in any way whatsoever, but at the dictate of conscience—the commands of those

who are invested with power, except in the case in which opposition is offered to the divine laws, "Wherefore be subject of necessity not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake" (Romans xiii., 5). And in conformity with this precept of St. Paul, the Prince of the Apostles also teaches, "Be ye subject therefore to every human creature for God's sake, whether it be to the king as excelling or to governors as sent by him" (I. St. Peter ii., 13-14). From this premiss the same Apostle of the Gentiles infers that he who rebels against legitimate human power rebels against God and earns eternal punishment: "Therefore, he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist purchase to themselves damnation" (Romans xiii., 2).

Let princes and rulers of the people remember this and consider whether it is a wise and salutary design for public powers and States to divorce them from the holy religion of Christ which is such a sterling support of authority. Let them reflect well whether it is a wise policy to separate the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Church from public instruction. Sad experience shows that where religion has been banished there human authority is despised. In fact, there happens to society what occurred to our first father when he failed in his duty. As in his case, scarcely had the will rebelled against God when his passions broke loose and disdained the authority of the will, so when those who rule over the people despise divine authority the people, in their turn, mock at human authority. There remains no doubt the single expedient of having recourse to violence to put down rebellion, but of what use is it? The body, but not the mind, is repressed by violence.

The dual element of cohesion of every social body, namely, the union of the members amongst themselves by mutual charity and the union of the members themselves with the head by subjection to authority, being removed or weakened, what wonder, venerable brethren, that modern society presents itself to us as divided into two great armed forces that contend against one another fiercely and strenuously? Face to face with those to whom either fortune or their own activity has brought an abundance of wealth stand the proletaires and the workers, inflamed with hatred and jealousy because, although they share the same nature, they are not in the same condition. Infatuated as they are by the fallacies of agitators, to whose guidance they are ordinarily most docile, who could persuade them that it does not follow because men are equal by nature that all ought to occupy the same grade in society, but that every one holds that position which his qualifications, if circumstances permit, have procured for him? Wherefore when the needy struggle against those who are well to do, as if the latter had taken

possession of property that belonged to others, they not only offend against justice and charity, but even against reason, because they also, if they desired, could by means of honorable labor succeed in improving their condition. What consequences, not less inconvenient for individuals than for the community, this class hatred begets it is needless to say. We all see and deplore the frequency of strikes, by which the course of civic and public life is wont to be arrested even in the most necessary functions, also the threatening crowds and tumults in which not unfrequently recourse is had to arms and human blood is shed.

We do not desire to repeat here the arguments which prove to demonstration the errors of the Socialists and others of that type. Our predecessor Leo XIII. treated of them most learnedly in memorable Encyclicals, and do you, venerable brethren, see, with your habitual care, that these authoritative teachings are not forgotten and that in Catholic associations, in congresses, in sermons and in the Catholic press efforts are always made to illustrate them wisely and inculcate them according to need. But in a particular manner —we do not hesitate to repeat this—with all the force of the arguments which the Gospel and human nature and public and private interests supply—let us be zealous in exhorting all men to love one another in a brotherly spirit, in virtue of the divine law of charity. Human fraternity, indeed, will not remove the diversities of conditions and therefore of classes. This is not possible, just as it is not possible that in an organic body all the members should have one and the same function and the same dignity. But it will cause those in the highest places to incline toward the humblest and to treat them not only according to justice, as is necessary, but kindly, with affability and tolerance, and will cause the humblest to regard the highest with sympathy for their prosperity and with confidence in their support, in the same way as in one family the younger brothers rely on the help and defense of the elder ones.

But, venerable brethren, the evils we have been deploring have a deeper root, and unless all the strength of the well-disposed is used to extirpate it, it is vain to hope for the attainment of the object of our desires, that is to say, stable and enduring peace in human relations. What this root is the Apostle teaches: "For the desire of money is the root of all evils" (I. Timothy vi., 10). And, in fact, if we duly consider the matter, we find that from this root spring all the evils from which society suffers at present. When by means of perverse schools in which the heart of the young is fashioned like wax, and also by means of writings which daily or at intervals mould the minds of the inexperienced masses, and by other means by which public opinion is directed—when, we say,

the destructive error is thus made to penetrate into people's minds that man should not hope for a state of eternal happiness; that here and here alone one can be happy in the possession of the riches, of the honors and of the pleasures of this life, it is not surprising that human beings, naturally made for happiness, cast aside with the same violence with which they are attracted to the acquisition of these enjoyments every obstacle which restrains or hinders them. Since, however, these enjoyments are not equally divided amongst all, and it is the duty of social authority to prevent individual liberty from exceeding bounds and extending to what belongs to others, there arises hatred against the public powers and jealousy on the part of the unfortunate against those whom fortune favors; hence, in fine, the struggle between the various classes of citizens, some seeking to obtain at any cost and snatch to themselves what they are in need of, and others striving to preserve and increase what they have.

Christ, Our Lord, foreseeing this state of things, carefully explained in His most divine Sermon on the Mount, the beatitudes of man on earth and, so to speak, laid the foundations of a Christian philosophy. These maxims have appeared even to adversaries of the faith as conveying singular wisdom and the most perfect doctrine on religion and morals, and all certainly agree that before Christ, Who is truth itself, no one ever taught anything similar in this matter, or anything of such weight and importance or so permeated by sentiments of charity.

Now, the whole secret of this philosophy consists in this, that the so-called good things of mortal life, though they have the appearance of being such, are not really so, and therefore it is not through their enjoyment that man can live happily. For on God's authority we know, so far are wealth, glory, pleasure from bringing happiness to man, that if he wishes to be truly happy he must avoid them all for the love of God: "Blessed are ye poor. . . . Blessed are ye that weep now. . . . Blessed shall you be when men shall hate you, when they shall separate you, and shall reproach you and cast out your name as evil" (St. Luke vi., 20-22). That is to say, through the sorrows, cares and miseries of this life, if we support them patiently, as we ought to do, we obtain access for ourselves to those perfect and everlasting good things "which God hath prepared for them that love Him" (I. Cor. ii., 9). But this important doctrine of the faith is neglected by a great number and is altogether forgotten by many. It is necessary, venerable brethren, to revive it amongst all men; in no other way will men and human society have peace. We therefore exhort those who are afflicted by cares of any kind not to fix their gaze on the earth, on which they are

pilgrims, but to lift it up to heaven, whither they are going: "For we have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come" (Hebrews xiii., 14). And amidst the adversities by which God tries their constancy in His service let them often reflect what a reward is reserved for them if they come victorious out of the conflict: "For that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory" (II. Cor. iv., 17). Finally, to endeavor with all possible activity and energy to make faith in the supernatural revive amongst men, and at the same time the appreciation, desire and hope of things eternal—this, venerable brethren, should be your first object, and also that of the other clergy and of all our spiritual children who, bound together in various associations, strive to promote the glory of God and the real welfare of society. For, in proportion as this faith increases amongst men their immoderate desire of pursuing vain earthly enjoyments will decrease, charity will revive and tumults and social conflicts will gradually subside.

And now, if we turn our thoughts from civil society to the Church's own affairs, there is certainly some ground why our mind, troubled by the great calamities of the day, should be, at least to some extent, comforted. For besides the manifest proofs which present themselves of the divine power and indefectibility of the Church, no little consolation is given to us by the splendid fruit of his active zeal left by our predecessor Pius X., after having added to the lustre of the Apostolic See by the example of a holy life. For, thanks to his work, we see the religious spirit stirred up everywhere amongst ecclesiastics, piety excited amongst the Christian people, Catholic action and discipline promoted in Catholic societies, here episcopal sees established and here their number increased, arrangements made for the education of young clerics in accordance with the strict requirements of canon law and as needed owing to the nature of the times, all danger of rash innovations removed from the teaching of the sacred sciences, musical art made to serve worthily the majesty of sacred functions, the decorum of worshipers increased and Christianity widely propagated by the new missions of heralds of the Gospel.

These are indeed great merits of our predecessor in regard to the Church, and posterity will gratefully bear them in mind. Since, however, the field of the good man of the house is always, God permitting, exposed to the wicked arts of the enemy, the fear lest an abundance of cockle may injure the good fruit should never prevent work being done there. Therefore, taking as addressed to ourselves what God said to the prophet, "Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations and over kingdoms, to root up and to pull

down . . . and to build and to plant" (Jeremias i., 10), so far as lies in our power, we shall take the greatest care until it please the Pastor of pastors to demand from us an account of the exercise of the ministry entrusted to us to avert whatever is evil and to promote what is good.

In addressing to you, venerable brethren, this first Encyclical letter we think it well to touch on certain of the chief subjects to which we have decided to devote our special attention and through your efforts to help our work by your zeal the desired fruit will be secured earlier.

First of all, since in every human society, for whatever purpose formed, it is of the utmost importance that the members should work strenuously together to attain the same object, we must exert ourselves by all means at our disposal to put an end to dissension and discord, of whatever kind, amongst Catholics, to guard against the growth of fresh difference between them and to induce them to think and act unitedly. The enemies of God and the Church clearly understand that any dissension between Catholics in defending the faith means victory for them. Hence it is a frequent practice of theirs when they see Catholics closely united to throw the seeds of discord between them astutely and try to destroy this unity. Would that their design had not so often succeeded to the great detriment of religion. Accordingly, when there is no doubt that legitimate authority has given an order, let no one consider he is at liberty to disregard it on the ground that he does not approve of it, but let every one submit his opinion to the authority of him to whom he is subject and obey him through consciousness of duty. Again, let no private person, either by the publication of books or journals or by delivering discourses publicly, assume the position of a master in the Church. All know to whom God has given the teaching office in the Church; let him have the unrestricted right to speak as he thinks fitting when he wishes; it is the duty of others to tender him devout homage when he speaks and to obey his words.

Concerning matters in which, since the Holy See has not pronounced judgment, saving faith and discipline, discussion may take place pro and contra, it is certainly lawful for everybody to say what he thinks and to uphold his opinion. But in such discussions let all intemperate language which may be seriously hurtful to charity be eschewed; let every one indeed maintain his own view freely, but let him do so modestly, and let him not imagine he is justified in casting suspicion on the faith or discipline of those who hold a contrary opinion simply because they differ from him.

We desire also that our people should refrain from the use of those appellatives which have recently been introduced to distinguish

Catholics from Catholics, and that they avoid them not only as profane novelties of words which are in conformity neither with truth nor justice, but also because they give rise to serious agitation and great confusion amongst Catholics. The nature and bearing of the Catholic faith are such that nothing can be added to it and nothing taken away; it must be either held in its entirety or entirely rejected. "This is the Catholic faith which unless one firmly and faithfully believes he cannot be saved" (Athanasian Creed). There is no need, therefore, to add epithets to the profession of Catholicism; it is enough for every one to say, "Christian is my name and Catholic my surname." Only let him strive to be really what he calls himself.

Modernism, from those of our people who devote themselves to the general promotion of the Catholic cause the Church now requires something far different from persistence in dealing with questions from the discussion of which no advantage is derived; she demands that they should most earnestly endeavor to preserve the faith whole and free from every breath of error, following especially the guidance of him whom Christ has constituted the guardian and interpreter of the truth. Even at the present day there are those—and they are not a few—who, as the Apostle says, "do not endure sound doctrine, but, according to their own desires, heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and turn away their hearing from the truth, but are turned unto fables." For, inflated and carried away by the great opinion they have formed of the human mind, which, thank God, has made astonishing progress in the study of nature, some, trusting in their own judgment, have spurned the authority of the Church and in their temerity have gone so far as not to hesitate to measure with their intelligence and to adapt to the mode of thinking of these times the very mysteries of God and God's whole revelation to men. Therefore, there have arisen the monstrous errors of Modernism, which our predecessor rightly termed "the synthesis of all heresies" and solemnly condemned. This condemnation, venerable brethren, we here renew in its full extent, and since the contagion, which is so pestiferous, has not been entirely removed and even yet creeps about here and there secretly, we exhort all to guard with great care against the danger of being infected by it. To it may fittingly be applied the words Job used of another matter: "It is a fire that devoureth even to destruction and rooteth up all things that spring" (Job xxxi., 12). And we desire that Catholics should not only keep clear of the errors, but also of the tendency and what is called the spirit of the Modernists. Whoever is affected by this spirit rejects disdainfully whatever savors of antiquity, but eagerly searches for novelties everywhere—in the manner of speaking of divine things, in the celebration of divine

worship, in the Catholic institutions and in the private exercise of piety. Therefore we desire that that law of our ancestors should be held sacred: "Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est" ("Let there be no innovation but in the sense of tradition"), which law, whilst, on the one hand, it is to be observed inviolably in matters of faith, should, on the other hand, serve as a standard in all things that are subject to change, although in these this rule also generally holds: "Non nova sed noviter" ("No novelties, but in a new manner").

But since, venerable brethren, men are greatly stimulated to an open profession of the Catholic faith and to lead a life in harmony with it by fraternal exhortations and mutual good example, we rejoice exceedingly that new Catholic associations are continually being formed. We wish not only that the number should increase, but that they should continue to flourish under our protection and favor; they will unquestionably flourish if they constantly and faithfully obey the directions which have been or will be given to them by this Apostolic See. Let all the members of these societies who work for God and the Church never forget the saying of wisdom: "An obedient man shall speak of victory" (Proverbs xxi., 28), for if they do not obey God by being obedient to the head of the Church, they will not obtain the divine assistance and will labor in vain.

But that all these things may have the desired result you know, venerable brethren, that the prudent and assiduous work of those whom Christ Our Lord sent as workmen into His harvest, that is, of the clergy, is necessary. You, therefore, understand that your principal care ought to be to promote amongst the clergy you already have sanctity befitting their sacred vocation and to train your ecclesiastical students worthily for so holy an office by the best education and discipline. We exhort and beseech you—although we know your diligence does not need a stimulus—to do this most zealously. Nothing could be of greater importance to the welfare of the Church than this matter, but our predecessors, Leo XIII. and Pius X., of happy memory, having dealt with the subject, we need not dwell upon it here. We only ask that the documents in question of those wise Pontiffs, especially the "Exhortatio ad Clerum" of Pius X., should never, thanks to your advice and influence, be forgotten, but should be scrupulously followed.

There is one thing, however, which we must not pass over in silence; we wish to remind all Catholic priests, as sons who are most dear to us, how absolutely necessary it is both for their own personal benefit and for the efficacy of their ministry that

they should be closely united to their respective Bishops and obedient to them. Assuredly, as we have said above with regret, not all the ministers of the altar are free from the pride and spirit of insubordination which are characteristic of these times, and it happens not unfrequently that pastors of the Church meet with trouble and rebellion where they had a right to expect consolation and help. Now, let those who so wretchedly fail in their duty bear in mind and reflect that the authority of the Bishops whom "the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God" (Acts xx., 28) is divine, and if, as we have seen, they who resist any legitimate power resist God, much more impiously do they act who refuses to obey the Bishops whom God has consecrated by the seal of His power. "As charity," says Ignatius Martyr, "does not permit me to be silent concerning you, I have resolved to exhort you to be unanimous in the thought of God. For if Jesus Christ, with whom our life is inseparably bound, is the thought of the Father, so the Bishops in the regions where they are established are in the thought of the Father. Hence it is right that you should concur in the thought of the Bishops" (In Epist. ad Ephes, iii). And all the fathers and doctors of the Church have spoken in the same way as the illustrious martyr. Add to this that whilst the burden of the Bishops is already too grave, owing to the difficulties of the times, their anxiety regarding the salvation of the flock entrusted to them is graver still: "For they watch as being to render an account of your souls." (Hebrews xiii., 17.) Must they not be called cruel who by refusing the obedience that is due increase their burden and anxiety? "For this is not expedient for you" (Ibid., 17), the Apostle would say to them, and that because "the Church is a people united to a priest and a flock bound to their pastor" (St. Cypr. Florentio cui et Puppiano, ep. 68, al. 69). Hence it follows that he who is not with his Bishop is not with the Church.

And now, venerable brethren, in concluding this letter our mind turns of itself to the point from which we started, and we again with all our fervor pray for the end of this calamitous war, in the interests of human society and of the Church in the interests of society, in order that, peace being secured, real progress may be made in evey branch of culture, and in the interests of the Church of Jesus Christ, in order that, being restrained by no obstacles she may be able to bear help and salvation to men in every part of the earth. For a long time now, it is true, the Church has not enjoyed the complete liberty of which she has need; that is, since her head, the Sovereign Pontiff, has been deprived of the protection which by the will of Divine Providence he obtained

in the course of ages to safeguard that liberty. The result of depriving him of that protection was, as was inevitable, serious anxiety amongst Catholics, for all who profess to be sons of the Roman Pontiff—those who are at a distance as well as those who are near—have a perfect and undeniable right to demand that their common father should be really and entirely free in the exercise of his apostolic ministry. Therefore, whilst most wishful that peace should be restored amongst the nations as soon as possible, we also desire that the abnormal condition in which the head of the Church finds himself and which in many respects is highly injurious to the peace of peoples, should cease. We accordingly renew on the same grounds the protests on this subject which our predecessors made on several occasions, moved not by human considerations, but by the sacred sense of duty—the duty, namely, of defending the rights and dignity of the Apostolic See.

Finally, venerable brethren, as the decisions of princes and all those who can put an end to the atrocities and troubles to which we have referred are in the hands of God we raise our voice in supplication to the Lord and cry out in the name of the whole human race, "Grant peace, O Lord, in our days." May He who said of Himself, "I, the Lord . . . make peace" (Isaias xlv., 6-7), inclined to mercy by our prayers, quickly still the tempestuous waves by which society, civil and religious, is agitated. May the Blessed Virgin, of whom was born the Prince of Peace Himself, kindly come to our aid and receive under her maternal care and protection our humble person, our pontifical ministry, the Church, and also the souls of all men redeemed by the divine blood of her Son.

As a pledge of heavenly favors and in testimony of our good will we lovingly impart the apostolic benediction to you, venerable brethren, and to your clergy and people.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 1st November, 1914, the feast of All Saints, in the first year of our pontificate.

BENEDICT XV., POPE.

Book Reviews.

RECENT FICTION. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This publishing house has done so much and is doing so much to counteract the effect of the popular fiction of recent times, which is getting farther away from sound faith and morals each succeeding year, that their efforts should be brought to the attention of the Catholic public as frequently as possible.

Catholic parents and others who have charge of children and young men and women must exercise a strict supervision over their reading if they hope at all to be faithful to their trust. It is almost impossible to exercise this supervision by reading the fiction of the day and separating the good from the bad. It is turned out so rapidly that no one can keep up with it, and even the best of it is so indifferent, if not positively bad, that one is tempted to condemn it all unheard. Rarely does one meet a novel now which teaches the existence of God, eternal life, future rewards and punishments, respect and obedience for parents and all lawful superiors, faithfulness to the marriage obligation, and the hundred and one other simple fundamental truths that every decent Christian is supposed to believe and practice. On the contrary, these things are ignored or mocked, and those who live in direct opposition to them are the heroes and heroines of modern times. One of our most popular, respectable and widely circulated magazines adorned the front page of its latest Christmas number with a highly colored picture of a boy who gets a copy of the "Lives of the Saints" in his stocking. The look of disgust on that boy's face does credit to the mechanical skill of the artist, but is a disgrace to the author and publisher. No doubt these will say that the picture is not to be taken too seriously, and that it will seem harmless to any one with a sense of the humorous. But its true significance cannot be brushed aside so easily. It is an index to the irreverence of the day and a sneer at even the suggestion that a modern boy should read anything so tame and commonplace as the "Lives of the Saints."

The lesson will not be lost. Against such a tendency—this is a mild word—the very best antidote is Catholic fiction. This does not

necessarily mean books that are professedly Catholic, but books that are certainly sound in faith and morals. Surely this is not asking too much.

Fortunately we have a corps of Catholic fiction writers at the present time who need no apologist. They are bright, educated, skillful artists, and their work is fully up to the standard of secular writers in every respect and far beyond it in the most important essentials—faith and morals. They should be encouraged, they should be read, and for that reason the announcements of a recent group of their works is subjoined:

THE IVY HEDGE. By *Maurice Francis Egan.* 12mo., cloth, colored jacket, net, $1.35.

There is no Catholic writer of latter days in this country better and more favorably known than Maurice Francis Egan, now Uuited States Minister to Denmark. From simple beginnings, nearly forty years ago, as the editor of an illustrated Catholic newspaper, he perseveringly made his way up until he became the Professor of English Literature in one large Catholic University and Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy in the Catholic University of Washington.

Dr. Egan's latest work, "The Ivy Hedge," is a novel of American life, and every page breathes of the soil. It is a genuine Catholic novel, teaching truths by example and not by preaching, and holding the interest of the reader from the first chapter to the last. If the aphorisms alone of the book were collected they would themselves make a delightful volume. Apart from the plot, the character drawing is masterly and true to life; and there are many strong scenes introduced, and some humorous ones, notably the description of the dinner at Trevanion's home, when he has become rich. Dr. Egan and the public are to be congratulated on this book.

—

FINE CLAY. A Novel. By *Isabel C. Clarke*, author of "The Secret Citadel," "By the Blue River," etc. 8vo., cloth, net, $1.35.

Here is a novel which should be read by every Catholic who cares in the least for fine literature and the finer loyalties of life. Miss Clarke writes throughout with delicacy and ease; she manifests a perfect mastery of distinguished diction, and whilst she never forces the note of her fervor or indulges in deliberate rhetoric, her pages are musical

with sincerely felt enthusiasm and glow with a very definite beauty. The writer is not afraid of the braveries of life, and it is pleasant to scale with her the heights of human character and to feel the rarefied air and tonic breezes of lofty ideals. The tale holds the ardor of perfect love, unrestrained, complete and strong; it reveals the treachery of passion and falsehood, and yet it finds no need for a word that jars or for a single expletive. "Fine Clay" may confidently and justly be recommended to every lover of fiction, and Catholics should see that the book is widely read and crowned by them with the highest honor that the unbodied academy of popular appreciation can bestow.

—

THE PROPHET'S WIFE. A Novel. By *Anna C. Browne.* 12mo., cloth, $1.25.

In this delightful story of domestic life, Mrs. Browne has gained for herself an enviable place as a novelist. "The Prophet's Wife" is a story with a thread of mystery running through it, and yet is nothing sensational, in the general acceptance of the term. The characters that figure in it are comparatively new to fiction—an upright Judge, with none of the petty ambitions too often seen in men of that position; a loving, devoted wife, happy in the affections of her son and daughter; a young man, ambitious beyond measure, whom the reader must become better acquainted with to know; a daughter, a pure, unselfish girl, whose sole aim in life is to gain happiness for those she loves, and Dr. Joe, a unique personality. The story is one of great interest, for the mystery, while hinted at almost in the beginning of the book, is not fully solved till the end.

—

SHIPMATES. By *Mary T. Waggaman.* 16mo., cloth, 60 cents.

There are good stories and better ones, but one of the best is this of Mrs. Waggaman. It has no deep, complicated plot; all is simple but unusually good; the descriptions are clear, spirited and impressive; the pathos is genuine, not the sickly, sentimental stuff so often substituted for the real article, and beyond all else it is thoroughly and fervently Catholic without an effort to be so. The interest of the story begins with the opening chapter and continues without flagging to the last.

Pip, a boy of twelve, is lying at death's door, without hope of relief, in close, unwholesome city quarters. His sister, Milly, a teacher, whose life is devoted to him, is at her wit's end to save him, when Judy, great-hearted, faithful Judy, maid-of-all-work, comes to the rescue, holding out the money she has hoarded for years with which to bury her, and will not listen to Milly's refusal to accept it. A shack at a wild, unfrequented spot on the coast is rented, and there the family, four in all, including Tot, the little sister, and Judy, take up their quarters. The only market is two miles distant, but they must eat, so Judy trudges all the way for their scanty needs. In seeking a way to have their marketing brought nearer their door, Judy bargains with a young man to bring what they want several times a week in his boat. In this way an acquaintance springs up with Roving Rob. How the excursions in his little boat bring back the roses to Pip's cheeks, who Roving Rob proves to be, and many other matters that cannot fail to hold the attention of the reader may be found in the pages of this fascinating little book.

FIVE BIRDS IN A NEST. By *Henriette Eugenie Delamare.* 16mo., cloth, 60 cents.

The scene of this story is in a little village of France, of which the author knows every inch of ground. It is the story of five children, and incidentally introduces many of the customs of the place. In the opening we are introduced to Father Janvier, or *Bonhomme Janvier,* as he is called, who in that part of France takes the place of our Santa Claus. The joy of the children at his coming, their delight at the presents he brings, are described with a spirit that evinces in every word the sympathies of the author with the daily pursuits, plans and plays of the little ones. It is a book that will prove welcome wherever it goes, and is sure to interest the young folks for whom it is written.

CATHOLIC MORAL TEACHING AND ITS ANTAGONISTS. By *Joseph Mansbach, D. D.,* Professor at the University of Munster. Translated from the sixth German edition by A. M. Buchanan, M. A. (London). 8vo., pp. 504. New York: Joseph Wagner.

Under the general title of "Ecclesia Militans," Mr. Wagner is

bringing out a notable and valuable group of books. Already Dr. Seisenberger's excellent "Handbook for the Study of the Bible and Bible Literature" has appeared; that was followed by Dr. Donat's striking work on the "Freedom of Science"; and now we have this very timely volume of apologetics.

Each number of the group supplies a distinct need, and this is especially true of the present number. At all times the conflict which began between Christ and His enemies when He was on earth goes on between His Church and her enemies. The very same charges which were brought against Him are brought against her, and many persons believe them for various reasons, as many believed them when they were first made. They take various forms—these attacks—but they are most frequently concentrated against the moral code of the Church. Just as in His day His enemies accused Him of associating with sinners, and therefore, by inference, of being like to them and condoning their offenses, and therefore, by inference again, of setting up a false moral, so they accuse His Church of teaching men a code of morals that is opposed to the divine law, and which, instead of making them better, makes them worse. Such a line of reasons makes out a very bad case for the Church indeed, as it made out a bad case for her Divine Founder and led to His temporary undoing, and frightens many into the belief that the Catholic Church is a menace to society and to the State.

It was to meet a condition like this that the various chapters of this book first appeared as a publication of the "Görres Gesellschaft," an association of learned men in Germany, whose chief aim is to preserve and advance the Christian-Catholic spirit in profane science and education. The work has increased in size and scope since that time. Intended at first as a defense against certain attacks on Catholic Moral Teaching, in popular literature as well as in scientific treatises, it has gradually become an exhaustive statement and vindication of the principles of Catholic morality.

The author says: "In dealing with these principles I followed a method which, while firmly rooted in ecclesiastical teaching and tradition, nevertheless tries to keep in view the demands of modern religious and scientific life."

It can be seen at a glance that the book is just as timely and

important for this country as it was for Germany. The influence of Protestant thought and sentiment in both countries is much the same. The accusations, partly ignorant, partly malicious, and very often mercenary against the practice of confession, against casuistry in morals, etc., find a ready lodging place in the minds of the opponents of the Church, irrespective of country and time. A treatise, then, on conscience and its relation to God and to Church authority, sin and salvation, the moral law and its relation to liberty, justification, interior and exterior action of grace, ecclesiastical and worldly life, is most important. If we add to these the important questions of public morality, of obedience to State and Church, of Catholic organization and permissible union of action with other creeds, of economic independence and unity, we shall see how exhaustively the author treats the subject.

Indeed, to say that the man fits the work is in this case no mere formal or complimentary phrase. His style is clear, his method exhaustive, his logic convincing. His manner is more that of a judge than a controversialist, and therefore his conclusions are more apt to be accepted by well-disposed opponents.

The writer has earned the gratitude of Catholics in general, but especially of priests, seminarians and laymen of the professional and higher walks of life who are frequently brought face to face with these attacks on Catholic morality and cannot easily lay their hands on the answer.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. Undertaken with the approval of the Cardinal Archbishop and the English Hierarchy. The New Testament, Vol. III., St. Paul's Epistles to the Churches. Part V., The Epistles of the Captivity: The Ephesians and Colossians. By *Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* Philemon and Philippians. By *Rev. Alban Goodier, S. J.* Demy. 8vo., pp. 42. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Before considering this new contribution to the Westminster Version, it may be well to recall what it does and does not claim to be. The original editorial announcement says:

"It is proposed to issue this work continuously in separate *fasciculi* of the same format, which, of course, will vary in number of pages and price, but which will be so arranged as to be capable of being (in regard to the New Testament) ultimately bound in four volumes, thus:

"Vol. I.—St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke.

"Vol. II.—St. John, the Acts of the Apostles.

"Vol. III.—The Epistles of St. Paul.

"Vol. IV.—The other Canonical Epistles: the Apocalypse.

"The Old Testament will be taken in hand later.

"The object of this new translation is twofold. First, to reproduce in English exactly what the Sacred Authors wrote with due regard to idiomatic differences of language; secondly, to produce the Sacred Writings, as far as external appearance goes, in a manner more worthy of their character. Accordingly these objects demand not only recourse to the best attainable original texts, but such apparatus of notes and explanations as will enable the reader to enter into the whole atmosphere and occasion of the several Scriptures. And, moreover, such care in editing that the natural divisions of thought shall be typographically expressed, and all obscurities due to arbitrary divisions and faulty arrangement removed.

"It should be clearly understood that this new Translation does not aim or claim to be a substitute for the old and familiar 'Douay' version, which, being based upon the Vulgate, must still be used when the Epistles and Gospels are read in church, until the final revision of the Vulgate makes a new version imperative.

"A beginning of the enterprise has been made with the Epistles of St. Paul, because by universal admission they stand most in need of being translated afresh. Most of the other Epistles are already in hand, but the future progress of the version will depend to some extent upon the reception of this, the first installment."

With this announcement before us, we must acknowledge that the editors are doing their work admirably. We have begun with it because whatever unfavorable criticism we have seen, and it was very little, has been based principally on a mistaken notion of the plan and purpose. The new version is delightful reading, and the notes are very clear.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS. By *Rev. F. Peppert.* The Sunday Gospels Explained to Children. For use in school and church. By Rev. M. Parks. Short Sermons for the Children's Mass. By Rev. Frederick Reuter. Conferences for Boys. By Rev. Reynold Kuehnel. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

The first volume of this group contains a short sermon for each

Sunday of the ecclesiastical year. They are not homilies. The writer does not attempt to give a full examination of the Epistle or Gospel of any Sunday, but he takes a sentence from one or the other and preaches on that. Sometimes he does not follow his text, but after announcing it, departs from it altogether. For instance, on the first Sunday of Advent we have an instruction on the excellence or necessity of meditation; on the third Sunday of Advent, the author speaks of the method of meditation, and on the fourth Sunday of Advent he tells us what subjects to select for meditation, although his text is, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight His paths."

These sermons are good in the general sense that they are about good things, and they are orthodox.

—

Father Parks' explanations of the Sunday Gospels for children are excellent in every way. They show careful reading and study; they are full, clear, accurate and informing. They are really arranged for school or Sunday school work, and they can be used by an intelligent school teacher.

Each discourse is divided into Preparation, Explanation, Questions for Repetition, Points of Instruction and Conclusion or Lesson.

There is, moreover, a logical sequence which is strictly followed, and the complexion between the Sundays, of the various seasons, and between elements in the life of Christ is clearly indicated.

It is a very good book.

—

Father Reuter tells us that his Short Sermons for the Children's Mass are the result of many years in the ministry and careful preparation. They cover the ecclesiastical year, they are brief and earnest, and they are made up almost altogether of examples. They are very good and can be used by any one who wants help in this field.

—

"Conferences for Boys" is a collection of instructions for the members of a boys' sodality, but they may be addressed to other boys with profit. They deal with such subjects as Confession, Communion, Vocation, the Commandments and the Lives of Saints

especially suitable as models for boys. The author shows a full knowledge of boys and their needs, and his Conferences show a zeal for their welfare which is most edifying and worthy of imitation.

THE PARABLES OF THE GOSPEL: An Exegetical and Practical Explanation. By *Leopold Fonck, S. J.* President and Lecturer of the Biblical Institute, Consultor of the Biblical Commission in Rome. Translated from the third German edition by E. Leahy, author of "The Passion," from the French of P. Ollivier, O. P., and "St. Melania," from the Italian of Cardinal Rampolla. Edited by George O'Neill, S. J., M. A., Professor of the English Language in the National University of Ireland. Lexicon 8mo., 829 pages, bound in cloth; net, $3.50; postage extra. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This is one of the really very important publications of the year. It was already well known in the German, and appreciated as an exhaustive study of this branch of the Sacred Scriptures, but it was a closed book to the majority of English readers until the present translation was printed.

The standing of the learned author was a guarantee of excellence even before the work appeared, for he was chosen by the late Pope Pius X. to take first place in the Biblical Institute now domiciled in Rome. The guarantee was made good, for the editor of the English edition says of it: "It is a monumental result of unwavering zeal, unresting energy and admirable gifts. It presents us with a complete and masterly explanation of all the parabolic discourses of Christ under all their aspects—historic, literary, mystic, moral, controversial."

An eminent German Biblical scholar said of the book when it first appeared:

"The explanations of words and things and the expositions may almost be cited as models; in all the author is powerfully aided by his exact, profound, first-hand knowledge of Palestine in its aspects and people, its manners and customs, its physical conditions. . . . A special merit of the learned writer is the energy he displays in assailing the false type of modern Biblical criticism, which has made some notable displays in mishandling the parables." After preliminary chapters on "What is a Parable?" "The Object of Our Lord's Parables," "Fundamental Principles for the Interpretation of the Parables," "The Kingdom of God in Parables" and "The Doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven in the Parables," the book is divided into parts treating of the "Parables of the Kingdom of Heaven,"

"Parables Concerning the Members of the Kingdom of God Individually and Their Responsibilities" and "Parables of the Head of the Kingdom of Heaven and His Relation to its Members."

Each parable is first given in Greek, Latin and English, and then the explanation. The bibliography is unusually full, and we may truthfully say in the words of the distinguished reviewers already quoted: "Fonck's solid work supplies a real want, and is to be most earnestly commended both to the student of theology and to the priest engaged in active work."

POPULAR SERMONS ON THE CATECHISM. From the German of *Rev. A. Hubert Bamberg.* Edited, with a Preface, by Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J. Volume I.: Faith; ready October 15, 1914. Volume II.: The Commandments; ready February 1, 1915. Volume III.: The Sacraments; ready May 1, 1915. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Father Thurston says of this book in the Preface:

"The Catechetical Discourses of Father Bamberg possess something of the touch of genius. It will be readily understood that I do not mean that they are necessarily brilliant in style or that they present any remarkable novelty in substance or treatment. None the less, it seems to me that they are quite admirable as essays in popular instruction, and that the straightforward simplicity, which is their most conspicuous quality, is exalted by something in the personality of the author and lifted above the level of the trite or the commonplace.

"The discourses, we are given to understand, were originally taken down by a stenographer in shorthand, and, in spite of the author's revisions and the inevitable drawbacks of a translation, they retain much of the spirit and the familiar tone characteristic of such impromptu utterances.

"The art of the teacher is most effectively displayed when his exposition appears to be the easiest thing in the world. Simplicity of language, lucidity of thought, homely illustration, all play their part, but there is nothing which does not seem to be within the reach of the humblest and least gifted. *Ars est celare artem—it is art to hide one's artfulness,* but genius has no need to dissemble, and it is in the spontaneity of this *nuda simplicitas* that the inspiration of the born teacher stands revealed."

There may be question as to the value of books of sermons which

frequently come from the press, and one is often tempted to think that most of them do not accomplish much of practical value. But these sermons are exceptional. They convey instruction of a most necessary kind. Taken as a whole, they present a practically complete picture of Christian doctrine and practice, so far as it is important that the laity should possess what we may call a working knowledge of Catholic principles. No one who has acquainted himself with the contents of these volumes will be ignorant of what it behooves him most to know, either for the salvation of his own soul or to give a reasonable account of the faith which is in him when he is brought into contact with his non-Catholic neighbors.

ODDSFISH! By *Robert Hugh Benson.* $1.35 net. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

Many of the friends and admirers of the late Monsignor Benson will be glad that in his last story—presuming this is the last—he has returned to that field which is always thrillingly interesting, is practically exhaustless, and from which he gathered his best fruit. There may be a difference of opinion as to which of this gifted author's books excels in language, in technique, in philosophy or in theology, but not a few persons think that none of his stories can compare with those which deal with the persecution of Catholics in England.

The author was singularly at home in this field. He knew England, he knew its history. Catholic as well at Protestant, he knew its people and particularly well he knew the upper classes, and he had the ability to make his reader know all these things. Here, then, was his special field. What wonder that with his talents he excelled in it?

The present story, which is historical, deals with the time of Charles II. The hero is a young Catholic gentleman in the secret service of the King.

His adventures are many and startling. Suspected, hunted, driven, he passes through many trials and many dangers. In the course of his coming and going he meets the King, his court, his friends, his enemies, and witnesses the martyrdom of two heroic companies of priests.

The story would not be a true story if it told us of so much of the affairs of men without speaking of their loves as well as their hates. Therefore, a love story. The final result of such a reading must be inevitably a quickening of faith.

RAMBLES IN CATHOLIC LANDS. By *Rev. Michael Barrett, O. S. B.*, author of "Up in Ardmuirland," etc. With many illustrations. 8vo., cloth, in box, net, $2. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The announcement of this book says:

"The romance of travel is here set forth in a most attractive form in this new volume of Father Barrett's. It is entirely unlike the usual book of travels, which in most cases might be more aptly called a guide-book. But here we find not only vivid descriptions of countries and their scenery, but pen-pictures of the people, their ideas, their manners and their way of living spread before us in good, plain language, which, in these days of slipshod English, it is a charm to meet. Then, too, the information Father Barrett imparts is not given with the air of a conscious pedant or bored traveler, but with a fresh candor that is rendered all the more delightful by the narration of diverting incidents of the trip. 'Rambles in Catholic Lands' has the charm that is lacking in most works of this nature—it is naturally written and the English is pure."

We are glad to be able to subscribe to all of this. In addition, it may be said that the book is charmingly made. The illustrations, which are numerous, are especially pleasing. It is better, perhaps, to adds that the travels are confined almost altogether to Germany and Switzerland.

THE HOLY BIBLE. 12mo. Translated from the Latin Vulgate and diligently compared with other editions in divers languages (Douay, A. D. 1609; Rheims, A. D. 1582). Published as revised and annotated by authority. Preface by His Eminence Cardinal Bourne. This edition contains Bishop Challoner's notes, newly compiled indices, tables and verified references; also Pope Leo XIII.'s Encyclical on the Study of the Holy Scriptures, and a new series of maps. New York: Benziger Brothers.

While we can always readily refute the charges that the Catholic Church is the enemy of the Bible and does not want it to come into the hands of the laity, we cannot deny that we have been a little slow in putting it into every-day, readable shape. Of course, we all know the ponderous tone, heavy inside and outside, that protected

itself against our profane childish hands by its very weight while it dwelt on the centre table from generation to generation and wrapped itself in the dust of ages. We can also remember the smaller book which invited us to open and read and then mocked us in a type so small as to defy the art of the most skillful optician. And we all have longed for the small book with the large type, which for a long time seemed impossible. But here it is—inviting to the hand, to the eye, to the mind; mapped, indexed, correct, complete.

ANCIENT, SUBTERRANEAN AND MODERN ROME: In Word and Picture. By *Rev. Dr. Albert Kuhn, O. S. B.* Part VII. 938 text illustrations, 40 full-page inserts, 3 plans of Rome in colors; published bi-monthly, in 18 parts. New York: Benziger Brothers.

As this work progresses, its beauties seem to grow. Each additional number increases the appetite for more, and only after several numbers have appeared does one realize what it means to have a pictorial history of Rome in its entirety, instead of depending on several more or less complete treatises on the various phases of the immortal city. Here we have all that is best in type and picture concerning Rome, ancient, modern, subterranean, pagan and Christian. It will make a magnificent volume when complete, and those who receive the numbers as they come from the press will be more apt to study them to advantage and digest them better than those who approach the work in completed form.

PERIODICAL

70771

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE